

JOURNAL

OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF BIBLICAL INSTRUCTORS

NABI

VOLUME I

1933

PART II

Symposium: The Bible in Modern Education*

THE SCIENTIFIC APPROACH TO THE BIBLE

PROFESSOR GEORGE DAHL, *Department of Old Testament, The Divinity School,
Yale University*

I N a recent essay¹, Dean Willard L. Sperry has developed the provocative thesis that we are living in one of the most ascetic periods of the world's history. This modern asceticism, however, differs from that of the early Christian centuries in that it concerns itself with the intellect rather than with the body. As a matter of fact, these contemporaries of ours are relatively easy on their bodies. But towards their minds they are bitterly harsh. Corrosive doubts they hug to their bosoms. With the promises and comforts of religion, which are in their opinion merely the illusory and phantom products of wishful thinking, they will have nothing to do. Manifestly, there is much that is unhealthy and morbid in this twentieth century asceticism. On the other hand, there is also something splendid and heroic about it. What is valid in this attitude we owe, says Dr. Sperry, to the scientific spirit. Rigorous intellectual self-discipline, with the aim of ridding the mind of stubborn presuppositions and hereditary inaccuracies, is a mark alike of the scientist and of much of today's prevailing mood. Our age stoutly refuses, sometimes at tragic cost, to sacrifice intellectual integrity for spiritual satisfactions.

Granted that Dean Sperry's thesis is valid in the main, it throws considerable light upon the problem of teaching the Bible to the pres-

ent generation. Our approach must be thoroughly and patently scientific if we are to commend our material to students who share this dispassionate and at times almost cynical attitude. We, too, must be fearlessly honest, quite open-eyed, unafraid in the search for reality. To be sure, the scientific approach is only one among several possible ways in which we may deal with the classical documents of our religion. This is sufficiently indicated by the titles of the various papers in the present Symposium. In their ultimate bearings some of these other lines of attack may even be more fruitful, or at least of more immediate concern, than the purely scientific one. Nevertheless every one of these approaches requires for its ultimate validity the firm undergirding of a method which is "concerned with the acquisition of accurate and systematic knowledge . . . by observation and deduction." In a word, the scientific attitude and spirit must always be in evidence.

That the actual application of the scientific method is attended by imminent danger of cold intellectualism must be frankly admitted. Nor have critical scholars in the past always succeeded in avoiding this peril. Perhaps their partial failure is one cause of the decline in popular enthusiasm for biblical studies today. Despite dangers and failures, however, the scientific character of our approach must be rigorously maintained. Clear-eyed and intelligent devotion to the truth, wherever it may lead, cannot permanently harm, nay it must

*The Symposium, with additions, represents part of the program of the Annual Meeting of NABI.

¹"The New Asceticism," *Atlantic Monthly*, January, 1933, pp. 288.

rather ultimately help to establish the larger truth.

It is in terms of the lower and higher criticism, especially the latter, that we instinctively and rightly conceive of the scientific approach to the Bible. No presentation of the subject of biblical criticism as such can hope to impart much that is new. Nevertheless, a partial survey will at least have the value of refreshing our memories and clarifying certain present-day issues. We will therefore briefly consider (1) some heroes of biblical criticism; (2) their outstanding achievements; and (3) tasks that remain.

I.

If we go back to the patristic period of church history, we discover but little that can be called scientific study of the Bible. Tradition, dogma, symbolism and allegory were influences too powerful to permit unbiased treatment. Both Origen and Jerome, indeed, contributed much to the study of the text. But their interpretations and commentaries followed the unusual allegorical lines. In all this period, and for almost a thousand years afterward, the only exegete whose views may be termed critical is Theodore of Mopsuestia (350-428 A. D.).^{*} His commentaries on Job, Song of Solomon and Paul's minor epistles reveal an independence of judgment which was, unfortunately, pretty effectively stamped out by the later church.

With the closing of their Babylonian schools c. 1050 A. D., the Jews brought their learning to the west. In Spain great thinkers like Maimonides held high the torch of scholarship until the mad expulsion of the Jews in 1492. Thenceforth Germany and other northern lands were enriched by Jewish learning. In fact, it would seem that the Jews had much to do with the awakening that led to the Reformation. At any rate Melancthon and Luther were indebted to them for whatever knowledge of Hebrew they acquired.^{*} Side by side with this influx of Jewish learning came streaming in tides of new intellectual life from the Renaissance. This humanism constituted another powerful incentive toward the scientific interpretation of the Bible. In their exegesis the reformers discarded the method of alle-

gorical interpretation; they also emphasized the contrast between Law and Gospel. But this quickening of the critical faculty, significant as it was, suffered partial nullification through the doctrine of verbal inspiration.

Following the Reformation, Europe passed through a period of intolerance and of ecclesiastical bickerings which greatly handicapped independent Bible study. Protestants as well as Catholics feared to follow up the implications of the literal exegesis. However, in 1670 the Jewish philosopher, Benedict Spinoza, published his *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus*, that clarion call to liberty of thought which has caused him to be regarded by some as the "great father of all modern Old Testament criticism."^{*} Then came Richard Simon in 1678, with his theory that Moses appointed public writers to assist him in the composition of the Pentateuch.

But it was not until 1753, when Astruc published his *Conjectures*, that the modern period of biblical study really had its rise.^{*} This French priest's demonstration of variations in the divine names, of repetitions, etc., and hence of several sources in Genesis, marked out the lines followed in Pentateuchal analysis ever since. Scholars like Eichhorn, Ewald, Kuenen, Wellhausen, Budde, Robertson Smith, Driver, Briggs, Harnack, Bacon, and a multitude of others, have carried forward into wider areas, both in the Old Testament and the New, the studies thus initiated by Astruc. Natural Science, Biblical Archaeology and Comparative Religion have proved useful allies in further developing scientific Bible study.

It must not be imagined, however, that the progress outlined above was accomplished without opposition. Throughout the whole period abuse and active persecution have in general been the lot of the courageous proponents of the critical approach to the Bible. The treatment accorded scholars like Robertson Smith, Briggs, H. P. Smith and Mitchell is but typical of the bitter ruthlessness of ultra-conservatism in resisting the intrusion of these new ideas.^{*} We have abundant cause to glory in these modern scientific heroes of the faith, the principal fruits of whose travail have been approved by further research.

^{*}See E. M. Gray, *Old Testament Criticism*, pp. 39-44; G. H. Gilbert, *Interpretation of the Bible*, pp. 139-143.

^{*}See A. Duff, *History of Old Testament Criticism*, pp. 98f; Gilbert, p. 193, n. 4; Bevan and Singer, *Legacy of Israel*, pp. 342ff.

^{*}Duff, p. 101; G. Gilbert, pp. 241-244; C. A. Briggs, *Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch*, pp. 36ff.

^{*}H. P. Smith, *Old Testament History*, p. XIX; W. E. Addis, *Documents of the Hexateuch*, pp. XXff.

^{*}G. H. Gilbert, pp. 262f., 266f.

II.

Only a few of the achievements of the pioneers can be recorded here. In general these scholars have vindicated the right and value of the application of scientific method to Bible study. Freed from the paralyzing dogma of an infallible book, men have been able to formulate, on the basis of their discoveries, religious conceptions that are at once spiritually potent and intellectually respectable. Inspiration has been shown to inhere primarily in the lives of the men who wrote the Bible, rather than in the exact words they penned. A new atmosphere of invigorating and creative freedom has come to permeate the whole attitude toward our religious literature. With it all has come a truer appreciation of the supreme and abiding worth of the Bible.

So far as details of literary and historical criticism are concerned, several conclusions seem firmly established.⁷ That the early historical books are composite, their approximate sources being those customarily designated as J, E, D, and P, hardly admits now of effective dispute. The presence of separate codes of law dating from widely separated centuries is also a commonplace of criticism. The apologetic motive of the Chronicler, and the consequent inferior value of all his writings as source-material for periods other than his own, is generally admitted. Several of the prophetic books have been shown to include writings centuries apart, so that in Isaiah, for instance, we possess a veritable anthology of prophetic oracles and poems. The prophets themselves are now acknowledged to be the original creative geniuses of Israel's religion, in whom the function of detailed prediction was relatively unimportant. Despite Barnes' recent attempt to isolate ancient elements in the book, most scholars have come to see that the book of Psalms, at least as now constituted, is quite late. The presence of legendary elements, both in the Old Testament and the New, is no longer the stumbling-block it once seemed to be. In the synoptic gospels, recognition of the priority of Mark and of the use of various "sayings" sources has cleared away numerous difficulties. Demonstration of the edifying rather than the strictly historical interest of John has made that gospel better

understood and appreciated. Against the political, social and religious background of their times the great personages of the Bible, such as Moses, the prophets, Jesus and Paul stand out more distinctly than was possible before the development of the scientific method. The fact of historical, literary and religious development has been proved throughout the Bible. The book has thus become a far more reasonable and appealing source of inspiration.

Another achievement of the careful critical study of the Bible has often escaped recognition. I refer to the demonstration that there is in these documents much that is extremely congenial to the modern spirit of scientific inquiry itself. Take, for example, Ecclesiastes. It displays in many passages a type of pessimistic, almost cynical, humanism very similar to that of the twentieth century. In Jeremiah, and particularly in Job, we find bold and fearless questioning of the moral order. The enthusiastic love of nature exhibited in certain Psalms is a not too remote forerunner of present interest in physical science. The preservation in many instances of two and sometimes three versions of the same story, both in the Old and in the New Testament, testifies to a spirit concerned, like that of modern historical science, with presenting impartially the full evidence. In this connection, it is not without significance that the later and more nearly scientific Creation story of Genesis 1 is placed before the naive account of the J writer in chapter 2. A genuine approach to modern realism is apparent in the biblical recognition of contradictory elements existing side by side. Good and evil, pleasure and grief, fortune and misfortune, the primacy of the group and the rights of the individual, the covenant God of Israel as opposed to the creator God of all mankind—these ideas coexist in the Bible just as they do in human life. The widely variant attitudes toward war, from the delight in combat reflected by Judges to the idyllic picture of Micah 4, or Jesus' injunction to turn the other cheek, is a case in point of this basic realism of the Scriptures.

Without the scientific attitude inculcated and exemplified by the great pioneers in biblical study, we could not possibly have come to that fuller understanding and appreciation of the Book of books which is ours today. It

⁷G. Dahl, "The Approach to the Old Testament," in *Education for Christian Service*, (New Haven, 1922), pp. 58ff.

remains to consider some of the tasks still waiting the worker in this field.

III.

From the foregoing discussion, it will be evident that I have little patience with any inclination toward "debunking" the older giants of criticism. I do not intend, in Alfred Noyes' piquant phrase, to "garland their necks with strings of garbage." Nevertheless, biblical science has not stood still, and certain modifications or corrections of earlier views must constantly be undertaken. The tremendous amount of new material accumulated in the fields of linguistics, ancient history, archaeology, and comparative religion, among others, needs to be digested, assimilated and correlated.* The evidential value of religion itself in any truly scientific investigation of religious literature and history requires to be taken more fully into account.* Important contributions still remain to be made in the realm of literary classification and appreciation. Needless to say, these contributions can only be made by those who combine diligence with a finely developed poetic imagination.¹⁰ There is also an urgent need for some sort of synthesis of the various approaches we are considering in the present symposium.

A number of earlier critical conclusions should be re-examined and corrected in the light of fuller knowledge. Take, for example, the minute dissection of the Minor Prophets in many of our standard commentaries. Books like Joel, Obadiah and Zephaniah are each apportioned among several authors, widely separated in date. It is high time that we inquire more strictly as to the cogency of the arguments alleged in justification of such radical procedures. Another live issue is whether

we are justified in positing a Trito-Isaiah. Jeremiah still offers almost virgin soil for the adventurous and trained explorer. The Deuteronomic problem will not down.¹¹ More heat than light has thus far been generated by the various discussions of the Aramaic background of the Gospels. These are only specimens of the problems that still await solution at the hands of scientifically minded students of the Scriptures.

To us as teachers of the Bible has been entrusted what we conceive to be in a real sense the "oracles of God" (Rom. 3:2). It is our privilege and duty to mediate these to a generation marked by a spirit of intellectual asceticism. Our aim is to direct this spirit out of channels of imminent scepticism and even cynicism into positive religious life and service. If we can catch the scientific devotion of our predecessors in the biblical field we shall be better able to serve our generation as they did theirs. The future of Bible study itself depends upon folk like you and me. More important still, the spiritual destiny of our youth is in great measure bound up with our skill in interpreting to them this supreme moral and religious literature of the race. Right now the whole world sorely needs the priceless spiritual treasures which we must learn intelligently and scientifically to communicate.

*S. A. Cook, *The Place of the Old Testament in Modern Research*, pp. 18-22.

*See F. C. Porter, *Harvard Theological Review*, II, 1909, pp. 265ff.

¹⁰C. C. Torrey's *Second Isaiah* offers, I believe, a splendid example of what needs to be done with other collections of Biblical poetry. See also B. P. Church, *The Israel Saga*.

¹¹See the symposium by J. A. Bewer, L. B. Paton and G. Dahl entitled "The Problem of Deuteronomy," in *J. B. L.* XLVII (1928), pp. 305-379.

THE SOCIAL APPROACH TO THE BIBLE

PROFESSOR S. RALPH HARLOW, *Smith College*

A brilliant teacher of economics in one of our leading New England universities closed his class at the end of the college year recently with these remarks: "Gentlemen, after all, there is only one solution of our tangled economic problems, only one way out of our difficulties. And that way was laid down in the teachings of a young Jewish carpenter twenty centuries ago. When men will apply his principles to the economic struggle we shall solve

our major problems." The professor who gave utterance to these remarks is not a church member, does not profess to be a Christian. He would probably describe himself as an enlightened pagan.

If there be any truth in his words, then it behooves those of us whose life-work is the teaching and interpretation of the principles of this young Galilean carpenter, to inquire into whether we are helping the younger gen-

eration to grasp the significance back of these tremendous teachings. And for us, one cannot disassociate Jesus and his teachings from the whole background of Jewish thought, more especially the thundering notes of the social prophets who preceeded him.

We may or may not agree with Bernard Shaw in his new religious fable entitled, "Adventures of a Black Girl in Her Search for God," when he asserts, "the ten commandments are mere lumber and the Bible as a whole is unsuited to modern tastes," but do we catch the significance of his admission that "a great deal of the Bible is much more alive than the morning's newspaper and last night's parliamentary debate. In revolutionary invective and utopian aspiration it cuts the ground from under Karl Marx, and in the epoch of great leaders and great rascals it makes Homer seem superficial and Shakespeare unbalanced!"

Must we admit that on many a campus, were you to ask the students whether Bible was stimulating, stirring, challenging—they would stare back at you as though you had gone insane? "Dull, uninteresting, insipid" are the descriptions one frequently hears when students begin describing the teaching of the Bible in many a school and college. On the other hand I have heard most enthusiastic reports of Bible courses from preparatory school students and college men and women.

If you seek to discover a reason why Bible courses are so often marked as dull and uninteresting you will learn that they have nothing whatever to do with the world in which we live and the problems our generation faces. I have yet to discover enthusiasm for Bible study in school and college without quickly hearing that it is so "real, and has such implications for our present social problems."

Now one may rise in protest and say that scholarship has a higher end than modern social problems and that the teaching of the great literature and history and archaeology and customs of the books of the Bible has no relationship to modern problems; that scholarship seeks no such ends as I am here implying. Very well, but know this, that the average intelligent American student ties the Bible and its teachings somehow up with the whole problem of religion and to the average student today religion is on trial. The only religion with which they seem especially sympathetic is conscience in action, the building of a bet-

ter social order, the vision of a new world in which justice, peace and brotherhood will cease to be mere words and become incarnate in men. How we should welcome that eagerness to discover whether religion has anything to offer in these lines, and whether the Bible is a treasure and a source of inspiration, a light for such as would walk toward a city of Goodwill, or, whether it is just a dusty old tome relating customs and traditions long since passed away.

But let us not take it for granted that students catch the significance and the relationship between the declarations of Amos and modern New York's panting after luxury. Our fathers saw no such implications even in the Sermon on the Mount as we are beginning to see. They pondered over the Scriptures and upheld the slavery of their fellows; they studied with diligence the teachings of the Prince of Peace and then went out to slaughter and kill their fellow Christians. It is idle to assert that all we need to do is to place the Scripture before people and let them study it and they will apply the principles to our modern social order.

Recently I had a startling illustration of this inability to see the relationship between Holy Writ and our own social problems. A New England church had invited me to occupy their pulpit on a Sabbath morning. For my text I had chosen the washing of his hands by Pilate. The theme of the morning sermon dwelt on the type of man we had in this Roman judge, a good judge, one who knew what was expected of him in a Roman court. And then the tragedy; the failure to live up to what he knew the truth really was in that case. The washing of his hands, because in that particular situation he was unable to apply the principles in which he believed in general to a specific case where his popularity and power were at stake. I attempted to show how difficult it was for all of us to cleave to the line of duty in specific cases, even though we know in general exactly what the situation called for in the light of the principles we claim to hold as Christians. At the close of the service I was invited to lead a men's Bible class where the topic of the discussion was "Prayer." Starting by asking each member of the class to suggest an illustration of what prayer ought to mean in our lives, one of the members of the group suggested Daniel praying from the room three

times a day though it put his life in jeopardy. Such an illustration was exactly what I had hoped for. So we discussed at some length the case of Daniel. Ought he not to have waited till it was dark? Would it not have been better to have prayed in his room where no one could see him? Would not once a day have been adequate under the circumstances. To all of these strong negative replies came from the entire group. We then went in detail into the nature of the laws of the Medes and the Persians. Still my class remained adamant for Daniel's heroic stand. The fact that he was an official of the government did not move them to suggest that Daniel might have been less daring. Suddenly I asked, "What do you think of the Macintosh case?" Not one single member of that class would defend the minority decision of the Supreme Court of the United States; not one thought that Douglas Macintosh had done well. Every member was for excluding him from citizenship, and no one saw any inconsistency between their defense of Daniel, and their attack on Dr. Macintosh. Naiveness in the extreme marked their generalizations. One man spoke up and declared that the "laws of the Medes and the Persians were pagan, so ought not to be kept, but our laws are Christian." When I suggested that it might be possible that a Congress pass a law contrary to Christian conscience, there was a feeble assent, though one arch patriot spoke up and said, "It might be possible but it hasn't happened yet."

Now these men were educated men, many of them college graduates. There was not a young man in the class, but they were the products of the kind of Bible teaching we have been having for the past two centuries in this country till a generation ago men like Walter Rauschenbusch shook us from our apathy and jolted some of us wide awake.

It may be a far cry from Amos denouncing those who "have sold the needy for a pair of shoes" and the wife of a New York City mayor going into a store and ordering nearly a thousand dollars worth of shoes and "mules" in one afternoon; but with the children of the tenements crying for bread only a blind man, spiritually blind, ought to be excused from seeing a moral for our generation in those flaming words of Amos.

Jeremiah standing in the streets of Jerusalem seems a noble and heroic figure when

he takes sides against the war lords and military leaders of his day, but it is harder to take your class into the cell of a conscientious objector to war and hear him cry out, "O Lord God, thou hast persuaded me, and I was persuaded; thou art stronger than I, and hast prevailed; I am become a laughing stock all the day, every one mocketh me." Almost any teacher can wax eloquent over that wonderful vision in the book of Micah "and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more" but it is quite another matter to declare that America should lead the way toward total disarmament.

In Georgia, I have no doubt, one can find many a church in which the Bible is taught as the very Word of God, holding the issues of eternal life or damnation in its teachings, to be taken literally, but how many of these churches are now protesting against the evils and the cruelty of the chain-gang system? And how many of our students go out from our classes with any greater social passion because they have tarried awhile with us over the pages that so burn with prophetic fire and through which the light of a new way of life streams as it does from Jesus' words and the example of His life?

The whole philosophy of violence is challenged in the pages of the New Testament, the entire economic order based on greed and profit is on trial in the Sermon on the Mount. But do our students see the relationship between these teachings and the issues on the front pages of our daily papers? For they are there in glaring head-lines, even as Bernard Shaw has said. But, I hear someone murmuring, "What sympathy does Jesus lend to modern pacifism, does he not in teaching and example support realistic militarism which calls for 'adequate national defense'?" Look at Him in the Temple with His whip of cords, or hear Him say to His disciples, "Think not that I came to send peace on earth: I came not to send peace, but a sword."

At any chaplains' conference or in any gathering of military men you may hear these arguments. But put these same questions up to your college or school class after three months study of the teachings of Jesus, and some side reading on the methods and results of modern war, and hear what they will have

to say. I have never known a class to fail to point out that it is a far cry from a whip of cords to bombers with poison gas and hell-fire poured down upon innocent women and children. They will assert that there is a difference not only in degree but in the principle involved here, between the use of a whip in the hands of Jesus against exploiters of the prayer life of Israel and modern instruments of war that mutilate and kill hosts of little children and old men and women in their homes.

It is a mere step from the treatment of Jesus of Greeks and Samaritans to our own bitter race prejudice. Only recently a hymn was submitted to a group of leading churchmen, seeking new hymns for youth. One verse contained these lines:

Create in us the splendor that dawns when hearts are kind,
That knows not race or color as boundaries of the mind;
That learns to value beauty in heart, or brain or soul,
And longs to bind God's children into one perfect whole.

The hymn came back with the request that the reference to "color" be omitted as it would give offense in certain sections of the country

where they hoped to sell the book. What are they teaching about modern social problems as related to Jesus' life and teachings in those communities?

Yes, we have a great opportunity in this troubled generation, we who are teachers of the books of the prophets and of the life and teachings of Jesus. Are we accepting the challenge? I believe that we are. To me it is the most hopeful sign in religion in America today; the emphasis on the social significance of the Christian way of life. Reinhold Niebuhr acclaims it in his new book, "Moral Man and Immoral Society." He writes, "Yes, there is beauty in our tragedy. We are, at least, rid of some of our illusions. We can no longer buy the highest satisfactions of the individual life at the expense of social injustice. We cannot build our individual ladders to heaven and leave the total human enterprise unredeemed of its excesses and corruptions."

The Bible was wont to be taught as the sure guide for individual salvation from an eternal existence of torment. Today we are beginning to see that if we are to rid mankind of a torment that may last for generations we have got to begin putting into our social order some of the fundamental principles contained in the prophets of Israel and in the life and teachings of Jesus.

THE ETHICAL APPROACH TO THE STUDY OF THE BIBLE

PROFESSOR GEORGIA HARKNESS, *Department of Philosophy, Elmira College*

"The ethical approach to the study of the Bible" may mean any one of three things. I shall speak briefly of two, then more at length of the third.

The ethical approach may mean, in the first place, the study of the Bible from the standpoint of character education. This is the main objective in church schools which make Bible study anything more than mere memorization, and in conjunction with worship, it is the reason for its use in the church service. It is the basis of practically all the contact students have had with the Bible when they come to us. Its failure to grip them is one reason for an initial prejudice against the Bible. Should it continue to motivate instruction, so transformed as to make it, we hope, more effective? This is an open question.

The old controversy as to whether the primary aim of a college education is the develop-

ment of scholarship or character has been worn threadbare, with the result, as in most controversial issues, that the only satisfactory answer is in terms, not of *either . . . or*, but of *both . . . and*. If it be urged that it is logically impossible for two aims both to be primary, I should maintain that if either be pursued to the exclusion of the other it is no longer worthy of a place of primacy. The only legitimate primary aim or emphasis is that which brings together all relevant elements in a unified synthetic whole.

It seems indisputable that character education, of some sort, is necessary for all ages. It is equally indisputable that the Bible is a rich store-house of character education materials. I should feel my work a failure if I could not hope at the end of a course that at least a few students had been stimulated to work out for themselves a more adequate

philosophy of life—a better basis for the enrichment of their own personalities and the enlargement of their social effectiveness—and this I take to be the essential meaning of character education. But I doubt whether the college class-room, whether in Bible or any other subject, is the place for much direct moral instruction. Every course, whether in calculus or the life of Christ, should develop in the student an ethical ideal of fidelity to scholarship, open-mindedness, and respect for positive human values. But no course, I believe, should be taught primarily for the cultivation of moral attitudes. To attempt to do so is to defeat one's end, for the moment one lets his class-room take on the atmosphere of the Sunday School or his lecture become a sermon, not only does interest languish but intellectual values which ought to be an integral element of the character ideal are pushed to the wall.

In the setting up of any single good, whether character values, religious worship, historical knowledge or literary appreciation as the objective of our work, we have a situation similar to the hedonistic paradox, in which the pursuit of happiness as an end diminishes the possibility of its attainment, while it comes naturally as a by-product when one achieves an integrated life in which all the major values find an harmonious and coherent locus. In short, there is pertinence still in Kant's dictum that "form without content is empty, content without form is fluid." If you will permit a rather crude paraphrase, moral propaganda without factual knowledge will not only make our teaching empty, but it will empty our classrooms, while the teaching of factual knowledge of the Bible without reference to its bearing on human living will leave our students blind to its richest values.

This carries us into the second sense in which the term "ethical approach" might be interpreted. What is the ethical way—not merely the pedagogically most correct, but the morally most desirable—way to teach the Bible? I shall not be presumptuous enough to try to tell you, though I should define the ethical ideal in terms of an harmonious enrichment of personality. I am more sure of what is not an "ethical" approach than of what is. Any kind of slovenly work, on the part of either teacher or student, is immoral. One is reminded of Carlyle's remark about

the careless carpenter who broke every one of the Ten Commandments at each stroke of the hammer. Any approach which is not faithful to the scientific ideal of scholarly accuracy is immoral. Any approach which does not cultivate the philosophic ideal of breadth of vision and steadiness of outlook is immoral. Any approach to the Bible which does not conserve and enhance the student's appreciation of its ethical, spiritual, and aesthetic values is immoral. To avoid such immorality is a task which calls for a union of open-mindedness with appreciation, of tolerance with conviction, of knowledge with vision, which, like all things excellent, is as difficult as it is rare.

The third sense in which the term "ethical approach" may be conceived will form the main basis of discussion in this paper. I mean the question of what a study of the Bible may contribute to a knowledge of the processes of moral development, viewed historically, and to an understanding and critical evaluation of ethical theory. This inquiry is pertinent, for no other book has influenced so much the world's moral progress, and there is none which illustrates more aptly the characteristic stages of moral growth.

I teach a three-hour one-semester course every Fall in the History of Ethics, about a third of which is devoted to Hebrew and Christian ethics. It is on the basis of this course that I shall state what I try to do. You will perhaps think that I am sinning against the Bible when I say that I teach the whole Old Testament in three weeks, and the ethics of the New Testament and the medieval church in two more. My defense is that I should be sinning against philosophy if I did not. The course is primarily one in philosophy, and for many students the only one they will get in that field, while all our freshmen have a three-hour course in Bible extending through the year, competently taught by Professor Mould. In fifteen weeks I must not only teach biblical ethics, but I must teach my students what ethics is, what philosophy is, what the underlying relations are, how morals emerged in primitive society, and what contributions were made by the rich streams of influence flowing out from Greece and Rome and merging with the Hebrew-Christian tradition to form the basis of developments in the modern period.

In a comprehensive course of this kind, two pitfalls are to be avoided. One is the tempta-

tion to dally in alluring places and have the end of the semester arrive with much untaught. The other is the tendency to hit the high spots so jerkily that one's progress resembles that of an automobile on a washboard road. I do not pretend to have avoided these pitfalls, but will say a little about the technique of the course to indicate how I have tried to avoid them.

It is obvious that every successful course must have, besides the basic factor of interest, a union of thoroughness and definiteness on the one hand with freedom and spontaneity on the other. As I have found no text-book which provides the foundation for such a synthesis, I teach the course on the basis of a mimeographed questionnaire. Beside each question are specific references, stated compactly by means of symbols which stand for book titles, and at the end of the section a list of general references. These references send the students both to the Bible and to the most usable discussions of Hebrew and Christian ethics. Save for occasional suggestions, they are left entirely free as to how much and what to read from each type of reference. They are expected to read according to their interest and give me at intervals an accurate record of what they have read, together with such critical comments and original observations as have occurred to them during their study. I allow a good deal of latitude about these comments, as about reading, for it is as impossible to require a student to have a certain number of thoughts each day as to write a poem upon demand, but they know it is not well with them if their note-books do not show a reasonable amount of critical thinking as well as reading. These comments afford a stimulus to make their own applications to current situations, and to correlate the material of this course with what they learn in other related fields, particularly history, literature, psychology and sociology.

You are perhaps more interested to know what goes into the course than how I teach it. We begin the biblical section with the question of why a knowledge of Hebrew morals is important, and attention is called to the influence which the Hebrew Scriptures have had, not only as the framework of Christian ethics, but as one of the foundations of moral development in the entire Occidental world. The section of the course just preceding has

canvassed the general conditions of the emergence of moral standards in primitive society, and the transition is made by pointing out that the Old Testament contains a wealth of illustrative material showing the movement from kinship to national organization, from collective to individual responsibility, and from custom morality to an increasingly reflective type. The students are reminded, furthermore, that the Old Testament makes a distinctive contribution to ethical theory in providing what is not found in any other great culture; namely, the record of a progressive moral development within a predominantly religion-centered civilization, in which the driving force is obedience to a deity whose will is manifested in a supernaturally revealed law.

Thus fortified as to what to look for, we give a session to an historical survey of the periods as a framework, and plunge into the question of what the concept of Yahweh meant to the moral life of the Hebrews. Enough case material is studied to make clear that in spite of Yahweh's "unaccountable moods" and the Hebrew's tendency to impute to him their own moral aberrations, nevertheless their sense of moral obligation to render to him obedience in return for his protecting care developed in them an ethical monolatry which had in it the roots of reflective righteousness. We face frankly the immoral, or more correctly the largely unmoral, elements in the early Hebrew consciousness.

The stories of the Judges period are studied in some detail for the apt illustrations they give of a primitive people's treatment of enemies, foreigners, offenders within the group, guests and women. The picture here presented of an undeveloped society, with its polygamy and concubinage, cruelty and trickery, collective responsibility and exclusiveness, is second only to that of the Homeric poems in clarity and vigor. I know of no source material anywhere which gives a more compact illustration of the obligations and clashes in obligations arising from the demands of hospitality, domestic morals, clan loyalty, vengeance and the sanctity of the vow, than is found in the story of the contest between Benjamin and the other tribes in the last three chapters of Judges. We look also at enough examples of generosity, gratitude and fidelity to try to get

a balanced view of the lights and shadows of primitive society.

The forces, moral as well as political and economic, which brought about the establishment and the sundering of the kingdom are discussed. We pause for a rather detailed study of the Covenant Code, first considering the general processes by which moral standards are codified and codes altered, then the particular attitudes regarding property and personal rights revealed in this one. A study of its capital offenses and its provisions with regard to cattle, slaves, women, strangers, the poor, etc. forms the basis for a comparative study a little later of the Deuteronomic Code, to discover what factors remained constant under the preaching of the prophets and in what respects there was progress toward greater social justice or retrogression toward an atavistic ritualism.

I also do what you may think beneath the dignity of a college exercise: I make my students learn, or relearn, the Ten Commandments. They are usually surprised to discover that the Lutherans and Catholics in the class have a different arrangement from what the rest are accustomed to. The barrenness of memorization is somewhat relieved by an examination of the problem of Mosaic authorship for its bearing on the contemporary setting, and by a discussion of the significance of each injunction in the development of the moral consciousness of the Hebrews.

When we reach the period of the prophets, the wealth of ethical material makes it necessary to resist with grim determination the temptation to linger too long. There is a particularly good opportunity here to discuss the interrelations of economic and moral forces, and to consider both the influence of dominant personalities and the forces which restrict their influence in the reshaping of moral ideals. The pre-exilic period affords so much chance to make applications to current situations that I am not sure that a teacher at this point can adhere very firmly to the principle of keeping moral propaganda out of the class-room.

A study of the social message of the pre-exilic prophets carries us on to the forces which brought about the exile, and then to the effects of the exile upon the religion and morals of the people. Ezekiel's repudiation of the doctrine that "the fathers have eaten sour grapes and the children's teeth are set on

edge" becomes more meaningful when this note of individual responsibility is viewed against the age-old doctrine of collective responsibility. Similarly, I try to make my students feel the sublimity of the concept of the Suffering Servant and the Hebrews' world mission, both for its biblical significance and for its bearing on the wider question of the general processes of increasing socialization. For both purposes, an understanding of its background of utilitarian piety and narrow nationalism is essential.

In studying the moral life of the post-exilic period, we examine the meaning and trace briefly the development of Judaism, looking for the causes and effects of the clash between social and legalistic morality. Attention is called to the variety of moral attitudes reflected in the Psalms, with a special look at the imprecatory Psalms to understand their juxtaposition with others expressing sublime moral sentiments. We study the moral philosophy of Job and Ecclesiastes enough to try to evaluate and compare their dominant concepts, and we do some reading in Proverbs and Ecclesiastes. Then with a final question on the contributions of Judaism to civilization as a whole (designed partly to combat race prejudice as well as to round off the period with an appreciative summary), this section of the course ends, and the sons of Zion give way to the sons of Greece.

After about a month of Greek and Roman philosophy, we return to the Bible again to study New Testament ethics. In spite of its superior importance, I devote less time to this than the Old Testament, both because the material is simpler and because it is more familiar.

We begin with an introductory question on the difference between an ethical philosophy and an ethical religion. Then with some suggestions as to what to look for, I send my students to the Gospels to discover the principal elements in the ethical teachings of Jesus. These concepts, of course, are not new to them, nor can they probe the problem to its depths, but there is a valuable exercise in bringing together Jesus' major teachings in a compact unit and viewing them against the background of Hebrew and Graeco-Roman ethics. Then follows a discussion of the sources of power within the Christian ethic, and the reasons for its failure to grip human

living after nineteen centuries of formal acknowledgment of its supremacy. We analyze and evaluate the charges which have been raised against it, such as its inadequate recognition of intellectual and civic virtues, its intolerance or its too great flexibility. Attention is called to the areas—domestic, political and economic—in which there has been marked divergence among groups as to their interpretation of the ethics of Jesus, and the consequent institutional differences flowing from such divergence in interpretation. This, of course, is done in mere outline. I do not attempt to cover the whole history of Christian conflict.

After a look at the communistic and pacifist ethics of the early church, the study passes

over into an analysis of the strains converging to form the medieval ethical outlook, the causes and results of theological orthodoxy, and the services rendered by medieval institutions and ideals. These problems, however, lie beyond the scope of my paper.

When I conclude the study of biblical ethics, I always feel somewhat envious of those who have more time to linger with these matters, and am inclined to say with Whittier,

"Let the curtain fall;
I know better than all
How little I have gained,
How vast the unattained."

Yet there is joy in the quest, and so rich is the material that there is deep satisfaction in even a moderate degree of attainment.

THE HISTORICAL APPROACH TO THE STUDY OF THE BIBLE

FLORENCE MARY FITCH, *Professor of Biblical Literature, Oberlin College*

I take it that our aims as teachers of the Bible are three—to acquaint our students with the Bible, to train them to a way of thinking which may open to them the doors to all knowledge and appreciation of values and to a habit of mind which may make them world-citizens, and to lay the foundation for a vital, personal religion. For all of these ends the historical approach seems to be the basic one.

The material with which we deal is an ancient literature; the national life and thought it presents belong to the long past; the events it records move across the stage set by antiquity; the symbols spring from a life remote from our own; the imagery reflects a thought grown strange to us. The opening words of the Bible are "In the beginning"; the closing chapters preview the consummation of all things. Even a more modest view of its compass recognizes over a thousand years between the earliest and the latest writings, and some two thousand in the period which its story covers. The Hebrew had an intense interest in history; the Jewish and Christian religions rest upon definite occurrences, upon what God has done. In nature He half reveals and half conceals Himself; He speaks in wind and thunder; He veils Himself with sun or clouds; but in history He makes known Himself and His will. Thus all understanding of the biblical material seems to require knowledge of the political and social milieu in which its ideas and ideals were born. Historical study

lays a foundation invaluable for every other approach.

Perhaps one reason why the historical approach attracts me is because I have a mind which wants to be inclusive, which dislikes the necessity of choice, since choosing always means rejecting something attractive. The historical approach may include not merely the national and international developments in which Israel was involved and the stories of wars and their heroes, but also the cultural advances, the development of thought, and its expression in literature.

The pressure of the curriculum makes it certain that the majority of students will not take more than one course in Bible. When I ask myself, how can I give in one course that which will have the most permanent value? another question confronts me, how can I give the student the key to this book, which for so many is sealed, and so open the field for his own further study? By training the student to handle the Bible as historical source material, is my answer. The courses would not be concerned with exact chronology, with synchronizing the kings of Judah and Israel, nor with other of the minutiae of scientific history. Neither would they be based upon text books, however excellent and valuable, about the history of the Hebrews or of the Early Christian movement, but they would send the student to the Bible itself. Even though guided by questions which point his

efforts, he may never secure such clarity and completeness of knowledge as texts would give him, but he will have learned to listen without pre-conception to what the ancients said, to distinguish between the times of an author and those which he describes, to challenge and to weigh evidence, to make his own appraisals. He has gained a background for understanding the development of social institutions, ethics and religion, and literature, in so far as this is possible in a single course.

A student enters his first college class in Bible with a different attitude from that with which he begins a course in Chemistry or Sociology. He has some definite theory about this Book; he believes that it is the inspired Word of God, or a repository of outworn superstition, or a collection of charming myths and fairy tales and exquisite poems of naive idealism, or he holds some less extreme view. Every teacher knows the difficulty of working with a group representing such variety of opinion, and of helping each one to make the transition to an open-minded attitude and a scientifically tenable position. My experience leads me to believe that the desired results are achieved with less of mental and spiritual agony and with a more solid basis for growing and vital belief by the method of independent historical research. By his own discovery, rather than by the iconoclastic dogmatism of teacher or text, he finds reconstruction necessary; often he finds it alluring; and sometimes he is almost unconscious of the processes by which he has passed from childish literalism to maturity of thought, from supercilious scepticism to profound appreciation. He may uncover springs of living water and no longer need another to draw for him.

A young woman, most conservatively trained, stopped after class early in the semester to express her bewilderment, saying, "I don't see where we are coming out." I suggested that perhaps that would become clearer as the work advanced. She repeated her statement and added, "But I do see one thing; it means more this way." Then, her face brightening with sudden inspiration, "Is that the difference between Fundamentalism and Modernist? that the Fundamentalist is so concerned about words that he misses the meaning, and the Modernist is so interested in the meaning that he does not care much about the words?"

If independent research is urgently needed

in dealing with the Bible, it is also true that here we have rare material, carefully collected and sifted, translated and ready at hand for our ends. While its contents are not history in the strict sense, they are historical source-material of the first water. Here it is more possible than in most branches of social science to give the student first-hand contact with nearly or quite contemporary sources for the period he wishes to study. Here he may sense the inevitable limitations under which ancient historians worked, the honesty and accuracy of their efforts when once their point of view and philosophy are appreciated, the complexity of their problems and of ours in seeking to interpret them, the impossibility of simple explanations and ready-made judgments. He is forced to intellectual acumen, to objectivity; he must try to see clearly and fearlessly and to report accurately. He gains perspective, power to recognize the essential and significant, recognition of the inevitableness and legitimacy of change, ability to read "the signs of the times," and skill in applying Paul's words: "Quench not the Spirit; prove all things; hold fast that which is good." Hebrew history is peculiarly fitted to surrender these values. It is unique in the isolation of its stage, and in the simplicity of its story, compact, brief, easily followed, in the concentration of the interest of its chief characters upon matters of religion and ethics, and especially in the contrast between the petty character of Israel as a political power, so long a mere bagatelle tossed about among mightier nations, and its influence as "the world's chief minister in things of the spirit."

The student who approaches the Bible from an historical viewpoint has opportunity then for valuable intellectual discipline. One of the professors of philosophy in Oberlin has said that the course in Bible did more than any other elementary course to prepare for philosophy, for the student had learned penetrating analysis and independence of thought.

As he attempts to hear what his source has to say, he makes a discovery. He is not dealing with inert matter or lifeless facts; his materials are living, concrete, individual. They cannot be understood by mere classification; to label Amos and Jeremiah prophets solves no problems; to call the books of Esther and Jonah inspired answers no questions. For the true historian there are no abstractions. Out-

side of Wonderland the smile of the Cheshire cat cannot survive the vanishing of the face; no more for the biblical student have justice, democracy, brotherhood been won by any process of mere logical inference, but only by the interplay and struggles of persons. Hebrew thought is everywhere concrete; even its concept of God is not metaphysical but religious. The Bible is peculiarly adapted to help one avoid the modern peril of one-sided preoccupation with abstractions. Truth is timeless, but its applications are infinitely varied. Certain concepts ever recur, certain experiences are old, yet new with every generation, certain questions cannot be silenced. Men are fundamentally alike in their needs, their impulses, their aspirations. In certain individuals we glimpse the infinite, yet not because they are abstract types, but because they are concrete and unique, and give solutions to our common problems which have in them the ring of the absolute—what Kant calls the universal and necessary. Isaiah's advice to avoid entangling alliances and to maintain a policy of isolation and neutrality was given in a time when foreign contacts meant only peril, spiritual and ethical as well as national; but it yielded to other utterances no less inspired when the prophets saw in God's unique revelation to Israel her opportunity and mission to the world. The modern parallel is clear.

The student may develop also creative insight. The Bible portrays with naive charm and yet with profound insight men and women remote in time, in land, and in culture. The ancient Hebrew, the early Christian live again, and the student learns to love them for themselves and to live in them. The story is told of a lost ass for whom several neighbors had searched in vain; finally he was brought home by the village half-wit. When asked how he found him, the man replied: "I thought I was the ass; then I went where he had gone." For the historian it is not enough to put himself in another man's place; he must become the other man. Such freedom from the limitations of self is one of the chief gifts of historical study, surely a preparation for the tolerance and humility imperatively needed in our sick world, even though it is true that sympathy is more easily given to the ancient Hebrew or the distant Chinese than to the stranger in our own midst.

Dean Willard L. Sperry of the Harvard Theological School closed a course of lectures recently delivered in Oberlin with a passage from an essay by Sir George Trevelyan on *Clio, the Muse of History*, which I may requote here. "History," he says, "cannot show which side is right today, it cannot even teach by analogies. It can do a thing less and yet greater than these. It can mould the mind itself into the capability of understanding great affairs and sympathizing with other men—for the exercise of the mind under such unwonted conditions sends a man back to the still unsettled problems of modern life with larger views, clearer head and better temper."

The scientific historian thus learns detachment; he faces facts with self-effacement; he seeks not the confirmation of his own theories nor immediate practicality for his own life. This habit of mind is a safeguard against perils that are ever present in biblical study and in the religious life, the perils of subjectivity, of vagaries of thought, of mystical experience, of conduct believed to be inspired. Something of the objectivity of science is gained.

Yet the very self-effacement brings self-fulfillment. Again the words prove true: "He that loses his life, shall find it." For history persons are the material—persons complex, diversified, developing, persons interrelated and interacting. The student is himself an actor with them; he is working on an "autobiography," to use Moulton's suggestive idea. He gains the sense of oneness with humanity, with all its strength-giving and enrichment. And, as we have seen, the Hebrew historian carries us one step further; man finds himself in partnership with God—God the chief actor, yet dependent upon men for support. From the early cry of Deborah against those who "came not to the help of Jehovah against the mighty," to the appeal of Jesus for laborers to harvest the fields already grown ripe, there is the challenge of human responsibility and the assurance of divine support. So man is saved from cynical fatalism or self-assertive pride.

Here he finds realism in religion. Certain facts in history are not to be denied and they point to the supremacy of personal values; the highest spiritual experience of humanity is not intuition only; it is also objective reality, with which he must reckon. Is not this the surest road by which a twentieth century youth may

find his way to God and to a religion vital for himself? He who counts persons of supreme value more easily believes the cosmos itself spiritual; he who cares for individuals believes in a God who cares; he who understands the prophets' dream can build for his own spirit some home of faith, and he who has shared their struggles, defeats and triumphs and seen

their long quest for God and human betterment culminating in the ethical monotheism of the prophets and Jesus cannot readily call all this futility. As he runs rapidly along the path, painfully blazed by pioneer spirits, he gains momentum to carry him on into the unknown future with courage unabated and eyes clear and unafraid.

THE LITERARY APPROACH—THE OLD TESTAMENT AS HEBREW LITERATURE

JAMES MUILENBURG, *Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences,
University of Maine*

There are evidences that we are emerging out of the stage that has for several decades characterized the biblical literary courses of our college curricula. Professor Torrey in his preface to Mrs. Church's admirable little volume *The Israel Saga* tells us that the literary study of the O. T. has yet to come into its own. But the background and materials for competent aesthetic literary study are present today as they have never been before. While there is by no means unanimity of view regarding the analysis and temporal order of source materials in the O. T., there is in general sufficient agreement upon which to base intelligent literary discussion. Nor is agreement necessary, for the student will naturally accept that view of the sources which appears to him most convincing and will relate his observations to that view. For example, it is likely that he will take a position on such controverted questions as the date, origin, and unity of Deuteronomy, Ezekiel, and Second Isaiah. He will have his conception of the character of the post-exilic period in Israel. His literary judgments will doubtless be influenced by these views. At the same time, it is becoming increasingly clear that aesthetic literary criticism has something to say on these questions. Archaeology, too, is rapidly increasing our knowledge of the ancient civilizations of Western Asia and of Egypt, and occasionally there are discovered materials which, if of little direct literary consequence, nevertheless have paramount linguistic importance. Again, greater recognition has been paid of late to those pioneers in literary appreciation of the Bible—Bishop Lowth and J. G. Herder. It is greatly to be hoped that some publisher will soon see the wisdom of bringing

out new editions of Lowth's famous lectures and Herder's discussions on Hebrew poetry. The literatures of Babylonia, Assyria, Egypt, and Arabia have come to us in convenient translations, and the position of Israel among these nations is now recognized at something of its true significance.

Of first importance to us is the work of Hermann Gunkel, who has done most to foster the aesthetic literary study of the Bible and has taught us more about Hebrew literature as literature than any of his contemporaries. If his researches into the history of religion and folklore have caused him sometimes to read too much into a literary allusion, this should in no way vitiate the vast store of literary materials that his books offer. Moreover, it must be remembered that a literary allusion may have a history which has been lost even to the poet who employs it, and Gunkel's calling our attention to its origin and subsequent fortunes can help us to catch something of what it connoted to the mind of the writer despite his apparent ignorance of its origin. Witness, for example, his researches into the ancient chaos-dragon myth and its impress upon Hebrew and early Christian literature. What can a passage like the following mean to one who knows nothing about this ancient mythological tradition?

Thou hast broken Rahab in pieces, as one that is slain

Thou hast scattered thine enemies with the arm of thy strength. (Psa. 89:10)

Or to illustrate my meaning from English literature, what a wealth of thought and feeling we experience when we read Shelley's lines

Lost Echo sits amid the voiceless mountains,
And feeds her grief with his remembered lay,
And will no more reply to winds or fountains.
In both cases does not literary appreciation of the lines depend to some degree upon the intelligibility of the allusion? And is it not a boon to the literary study of the O. T. when literally hundreds of similar passages can be read in the light of the background of a racial and cultural tradition? Gunkel possessed the qualifications essential for a literary understanding of the Bible: adequate linguistic training, fine sensitiveness to literary values, a quick sense for form, and an amazing familiarity with ancient literature and primitive folkways. If literary inquiry into the Hebrew Scriptures is to advance in a fruitful and worthy direction, it will do well to take the general course paved by Gunkel and some of his followers. I do not think it too much to say that the weakness of our American literary courses in the Bible is that they have been for the most part oblivious of this movement and have relied chiefly on the all too few fragments of Gunkel that have thus far appeared in English.

A contribution of a somewhat different sort is Professor Torrey's commentary on Second Isaiah, which recognizes the supreme greatness of the poet and offers in substantiation of that thesis valuable literary discussion. Statements like the following are as of much moment for Hebrew literary history as for the history of religion:

We see here, for the first time in the world's literature, a highly developed religious philosophy filled with the warmth of a universal sympathy; a new and profound creation made possible by the close contact of many races and modes of thought, but most of all by the steady advance and enrichment of the Hebrew faith . . . No Hebrew writer made a deeper and more lasting impression on the literature and life of his people. (p. vii f.)

From the time when these poems first became well known, they were seized and cherished as the noblest expression of the past that the religion of Israel had produced. The whole succession of Jewish and Christian Scriptures from that time onward turned to them for inspiration.

(p. 75)

O. T. scholarship has done more, much more, than what is here indicated or suggested. Everyone can recall for himself admirable literary estimates and comments from the vast literature of O. T. commentary. Time would fail us to tell of Karl Budde, whose treatment of the Hebrew lamentation, while only one among many of his achievements, nevertheless constitutes a signal triumph of critical literary insight and an epoch-making event in the story of the literary appreciation of the Bible; of Eduard Sievers, whose metrical studies have done so much for the cause of strophic criticism; of S. R. Driver, whose *Literature of the Old Testament* provides invaluable statistical data as well as adequate summaries of literary style; of A. R. Gordon, whose feeling for the Hebrew language makes his books fascinating as well as useful; of G. B. Gray, whose scholarly work on *The Forms of Hebrew Poetry* does for us what no other book in English that I know of succeeds in doing by its graphic discussion of metrics and its liberal use of the Hebrew, so that even the untrained student can follow the line of argument without difficulty; of the various contributors to Peake's *Commentary on the Bible*; of Professor Kent and his indispensable *Student's Old Testament* volumes; of J. P. Peters and his *The Psalms as Liturgies* and *Early Hebrew Story*; of George Adam Smith, of C. F. Burney, of Henry Thatcher Fowler and J. A. Bewer. Nor should we omit the relevant literary discussions in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible* and Cheyne and Black's *Encyclopaedia Biblica*. Illustrative are Budde's famous treatment of Hebrew poetry in the former and the articles of G. F. Moore and C. H. Toy on Historical Literature and Wisdom Literature respectively in the latter.

Another important phase of our hasty survey includes that large and varied class of books which have long since won their way into our college Bible courses. The pioneer work here was Richard Green Moulton's *A Literary Study of the Bible*. Recent years have not dealt justly with this book, for it still deserves careful reading and study despite its error (by no means unparalleled!) of attempting to apply Greek literary canons to Hebrew literary forms. Of course, it is forcing Hebrew literature unduly to classify it as epic, lyric, and dramatic, or to denominate the sonnet as a Hebrew literary form, but we must

not exaggerate this shortcoming. Despite his erroneous nomenclature Professor Moulton had an unusual sense for literary form. It is a glaring omission, therefore, when German scholarship does not mention the name of Moulton in the history of its *formgeschichtliche* movement. His book is "an account of the leading forms of literature represented in the sacred writings," and "its underlying principle is that a clear grasp of the outer literary form is an essential guide to the inner matter and spirit." Among the many books worthy of inclusion in the roll of honor are John F. Genung's *Guidebook to the Biblical Literature* (1909), *Hebrew Literature of Wisdom* (1906), and his beautiful little book *The Epic of the Inner Life* (1897); J. H. Gardner's *The Bible as English Literature* (1918); Horace Kallen's *The Book of Job as Greek Tragedy* (1918); J. H. Penniman's *A Book About the English Bible* (1919); J. S. Stevens' *The English Bible* (1921); Laura H. Wild's *A Literary Guide to the Bible* (1922); P. C. Sand's *Literary Genius of the Old Testament* (1924); Charles A. Dinsmore's *The Bible as English Literature* (1931), and Mrs. Church's recent *The Israel Saga* (1932). These titles illustrate the wide diversity of understanding concerning the meaning of literary study.

Some of the authors make it unmistakably clear that it is the English Bible of which they are writing, but, of course, an understanding of the English Bible can not be pursued without some understanding of Hebrew literary modes. They all, therefore, have some discussion of the parallelism of Hebrew poetic structure. Others of them present a strange confusion between English and Hebrew literature, a confusion that may be justified perhaps by pedagogical considerations. The King James version is in certain cases singled out as the only English rendering that reproduces the original adequately. One is quite willing to assent to praise of the "Authorized" Version. It is only when constant references are made to the relation of this translation to the original Hebrew that one is inclined to be suspicious. It may be true that William Tyndale succeeded as did no other translator in catching the spirit of the original, but I think it must be conceded that it is Elizabethan English that we are reading and that this English rendering gives us no clear idea of the variety of style that is reflected in the Hebrew Bible. We

should also heed well the observations of Professor Moulton on the comparative value of the English Revised and King James versions: "The critics will take single verses or expressions, and, as it were, taste them with their mental palate to see whether the literary flavour of the old or the new be superior. But comparisons of this kind are a sheer impossibility. No one, least of all a cultured critic, can separate in his mind between the sense of beauty which comes from association and the beauty which is intrinsic; the softening effect of time and familiarity is needed before any translation can in word and phrase assume the even harmony of a classic."

Finally, there is shortly to appear from the press a book by Duncan B. MacDonald, *The Hebrew Literary Genius*, which raises the whole discussion of our subject to a new level. Professor MacDonald has an almost incredible acquaintance with world literature and what is more he does not speak of it in the fashion of a dilettante. But it is his abundant knowledge of Arabic literature that gives the most striking impress to the book. Nowhere, so far as I am aware, are the Hebrew affinities to Arabic literature stated with such authority and in so much detail as here. The general point of view is expressed in Chapter I as follows:

The Hebrews, it has become plain, were simply an Arabic clan which under strange and unique guidance entered Palestine and settled there. But they remained Arabic, although they denounced the name, and their literature throughout all their history to this day, in its methods of production and recorded forms, is of Arabic scheme and type. Every kind of literature in the O. T., with the possible exception of the Psalms, finds a pigeon-hole for itself in the great scheme of Arabic letters.

In almost every chapter that follows, the wealth of Arabic literature is abundantly drawn upon, but one cannot but wish that Professor MacDonald had found it possible to quote more of the literature which he so generously cites. If complaints are raised that little or nothing is made of Babylonian, Egyptian and Phoenician literatures in their relation to the O. T., one may perhaps explain that the author is merely attempting to bring

the rich fruit of many years of study in the literature of Arabia to bear upon the Bible, and that in so doing he has filled a notable lacuna in the popular literature of our subject. There is much that is unconventional in *The Hebrew Literary Genius* and some of the positions taken should certainly not go unchallenged. Intellectual maturity, ripe scholarship, striking independence of judgment, knowledge of philosophy and theology, and a genuine appreciation of the oriental mind make this book a contribution of real importance to our study. Professor MacDonald deals little with matters of literary form, and there are suggestions here and there that he does not approve the *formgeschichtliche* emphasis of Gunkel and his school. The following words toward the close of his chapter on "The Hebrews and their Poets" are selected at random, but they illustrate the quality of much of the book:

In all of these cases we are face to face with an immediate individual singer, singing the song of a moment under the impulse of a moment. Hebrew poetry was all under impulse and the Hebrew poet could not rule and control his form. He could not think out and plan his poem and work through it in detail, polishing line by line. Flashing phrases he could strike out, and brilliant pictures, "jewels six words long that on the stretched forefinger of all time sparkle forever," but it was not given to him to wield "the noblest (sic) measure ever moulded by the lips of man." There, strangely, the Arabs were his masters, for their great measure, *Tawil*, is the only verse that can hold its own with the Vergilian hexameter. The Hebrew poet was always improvising and he could never reach the great paradox and wonder of Pindar—otherwise so near to him—in Greek poetry.

For such subjects as the Hebrew view of nature, the Hebrew attitude toward the weird, Hebrew "philosophy" (Professor MacDonald would not use the quotation marks!), Hebrew psychology, and for competent literary criticism of Hebrew literature we were in sore need of an adequate treatment, and Professor MacDonald has given it to us.

The foregoing sketch professes to do little more than to review some of the contributions

to the literary study of the Bible. I think it is clear that the time is ripe for an advance in this kind of study in which the nature and scope of the subject will be more clearly defined than they have been in the past. In the space remaining I should like to discuss what may appear to many mere well-worn commonplaces, but I do so because I think they are worth rehearsing periodically. In all this discussion I hope that the reader will never forget that the literature we are dealing with is supremely and uniquely great religious literature, that its passionate quest throughout is for God, and that no amount or extent of study of formal aspects should ever dim for us the intensity and fervor of Israel's religious aspiration. Subtly and insidiously humanistic emphases have insinuated themselves into our teaching of the O. T. so that we have sometimes succeeded in interpreting it into a religion utterly foreign to the Hebrew genius. This is true even of those of us who thought we were fighting at Armageddon for the cause of theistic religion. We should do well to set touchstones for ourselves in our approach to this Scripture, touchstones such as Isaiah's passionate "The whole earth is full of his glory," the Psalmist's

Whom have I in heaven but Thee?

There is none upon earth that I desire
beside Thee.

Israel's supreme command, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy strength," Second Isaiah's "I am the Lord; and there is none else." As teachers of the O. T. I believe we may repeat what Claude Montefiore, that noble expositor of both the O. T. and the N. T., has said of the Old: "As the patriarch said of this place, so do we say of the Book, 'God is in it,' and because God is in it, it has an authority of its own, and a special authority for us, who are the heirs of the charge, of which the book describes the foundation, and to which it asserts the claim, *Ye are my witnesses.*" Those of us who have dwelt with this literature, have tarried with it and listened, have been humbled and condemned by it, and have listened again and again, can not do less. For some of us this is the least that can be said. To harbor the possibility of something less would be faithlessness to God.

What remains of Israel's literature is but a brand plucked from the burning. There was

more, much more, but how much more we shall never know. The numerous hidden allusions to an ancient mythological motif and their occasional recrudescences in the literature of apocrypha and apocalypse, bear witness to what was one undoubtedly an extensive mythological tradition. The references to Daniel, Noah, and Job in Ezekiel, and the type of literary remains that are extant in the O. T. and elsewhere relating to them, would suggest a literature in which these patriarchal personages figured large. Who has not wished that the compilers of the Pentateuch and the Prophets had incorporated the whole of the Books of Jashar and the Wars of Yahweh into their writings? Much of what we have is but fleeting fragments. Frequently we may feel justified in believing that the best has been transmitted to us, but we cannot be sure. The priestly compilers and editors could deal in ways that appear to us passing strange. If they had only possessed a wider range of imagination and a little more humor! But the priestly mind has frequently wrought infinitely worse in history, and we may marvel that they retained *what* they did and sometimes *as* they did.

The criterion for selection and inclusion was unquestionably a strong religious interest. We should be cautious in estimating the amount of non-religious literature which has been lost, for a strong religious interest dominated the life and literature of the ancient Orient. In the case of Israel we may assume that this religious interest was extraordinarily vital. But to what extent it excluded other interests it must be difficult to say. As for the O. T. corpus, it is thoroughly imbued with a deep religious interest; and where the original sources failed to reflect the desired depth or quality of religious conviction, the editors and compilers saw to it that they were changed to reflect their own views, whether Deuteronomistic, Priestly, or what not.

The great Romanticist, J. G. Herder, was fond of describing what he thought was characteristically and uniquely *Hebrew*. Recognition in recent decades, however, of the strongly syncretistic character of Hebrew religion naturally forbids hasty generalization. We may run the danger of being lost at times in a fog of relativism, but occasionally in our study we rise above the fog into the sunlight again only to realize that we have ascended

heights which the Hebrews alone of all the peoples of the ancient Near East attained. Literary criticism has always stressed the value and importance of comparison. When we read today the records of Semitic mythology, or the hymns and prayers of the Babylonians and Egyptians, and place them over against similar Hebrew creations, I think we have a chance to discern something that is peculiarly Hebrew. Not that this particular line is superior to that, but that the whole of the one is certainly different in quality from the whole of the other. Comparison is fraught with dangers, for time and provenance must be regarded, but it can be made an instrument of the greatest worth. In reading the O. T. we must remember that we are reading the work of the Hebrew people, that the people is its author in a sense that is not true of modern literature where anonymity is exceptional and individual authorship intrudes itself conspicuously.

If it is the function of intelligent literary study, as of all criticism, to view our object as in itself it really is, then we must apprise ourselves of the barriers that obscure the view between us and the O. T. Each of these deserves extended comment, but I shall have space merely to mention them here. First of all, we must read the Old Testament through the medium of a translation. At best we are always at one remove from the original. Moreover, we are dealing with an *ancient* literature, very ancient indeed, even if we accept the view that the greater part of it is post-exilic. At a time when the cult of modernity has won to itself large portions of the college community, the call to antiquity must be faint. Further, the stamp of the East is upon the O. T. indelibly, and we are practically unequipped with literature which will adequately interpret the ways and thoughts of the Nearer Orient to us. I have referred above to the superimposition of modern humanistic philosophy upon an intensely theistic literature. The fact that passages here and there in Job and elsewhere can be interpreted humanistically does not alter the case. Finally, it is not so generally recognized, I think, how far the compilatory process in the O. T. extends. It is not enough to analyze the sources of the Pentateuch, the strands of Samuel and Kings, the diversity of authorship of the Psalms. Proverbs and Job are clearly compilations of Wisdom literature, and Job

as well as Proverbs will remain a puzzle until we recognize this. Isaiah and Jeremiah gathered about them other prophecies as readily as Job took to itself independent Wisdom poems. In the pseudepigraphic literature of Enoch we meet with the same phenomenon, for here too various apocalypses have found ready refuge.

We have succeeded to some extent in removing each one of these barriers, and our task for the future is to determine in what ways we may attempt to remove them more completely. For example, how may we come nearer to the original Hebrew? For our students, at least, we shall have to continue to trust to translations, but we can consult a great variety of these and make for ourselves a list of passages and of the translations which best reflect the meaning and spirit of the original. He who has read Isaiah's magnificent poem 9:8-10:4 in Moffat's translation in panting breathlessness (as it should be read!) knows what possibilities may lie in translation.

But our function as teachers of the literature of the O. T. is more than the conquest of these obvious barriers. There are numerous specifically literary problems which we shall have to face and solve. In every one of these problems there is much important work to do. In fact, the field here is comparatively unworked in any thoroughly satisfactory way. In the first place, there is the persistent problem of nomenclature. What do we mean by a myth? Anyone who has sought to learn from books and dictionaries will recognize how diverse and discrepant the answers are. But if the task of careful definition is accomplished so that the nature and function of the myth are clear, it will be as fruitful for religion as for literature. What is a saga? O. T. scholarship in America has copied its definitions from German books and has neglected to look into English usage of the term. The word is seldom properly used in literary books on the Bible. What is the difference between saying that there are epic narratives in Genesis and saying that there are epics in the O. T.? Is the latter statement true? Can Job be legitimately called a drama? Has it been influenced by Euripidean tragedy? Are Ruth and Jonah short stories? What is the nature of the *lamentation*? What do we mean by an idyl, ode, or essay? To what extent are they represented in the O. T.?

In the second place, we shall have to make a thorough study of the *formal* character of Hebrew literature. We are little disposed in America to accept a criticism based on literary form for the reason that we are not a form-loving people. In Europe, however, form plays a much greater role in the life of the people, while in the Orient it has woven itself inextricably into the social life of the whole population. If the East is inclined to be conservative and unchanging, it is certainly so in its courtesies, ceremonies, and even the ordinary vicissitudes of human relations. Travelers in the East are always more or less surprised to learn that ancient biblical expressions are still employed by the people of the land. The literature of the Bible, which reflects the social customs of the Hebrews and was evoked by a great variety of social situations, legal, domestic, religious (cf. Gunkel's *Sitz im Leben*) naturally reflects the formal phraseology of these occasions. The phenomenon of poetic parallelism with its balancing of parts, whether it be complementary, antithetic, or climactic, shows one way in which a feeling for form asserted itself. The compilers of the books of Genesis, Judges, and Kings cast their materials into a mechanical framework with certain definite introductions and conclusions. Similarly mechanical are the acrostic poems, the five-fold divisions and groupings of many biblical and late-Jewish books, the rubrics and refrains of Genesis and the Psalms. The first chapter of Genesis is formal in the extreme. The doom-songs of Amos 1 and 2 and the visions in the closing chapter of the book are cast in the form of a fixed literary mould. The prologue to Job is almost a perfect illustration of a literary form of folk tale and again can be paralleled in both the Old and New Testament, as well as in the literature of the folktale of other nations. These illustrations are all obvious enough to anyone who will go to the trouble of analyzing them. But they scarcely illustrate adequately the artistic effect of literary structure. Mrs. Church has recently done this in a very satisfactory way in her study of some of the narratives in Genesis, notably the Sodom-Gomorra and Jacob stories, and Gunkel has done it with almost too detailed precision in his edition of the Psalms. Professor Torrey has shown how fond Second Isaiah is of drawing companion pictures in his poems and of setting the one

definitely over against the other. Isaiah 34 and 35 are an admirable illustration of this, and the phenomenon has its parallels elsewhere in the O. T. as well as in the N. T. One could pursue these studies into the stories of Daniel and the poems of the prophets to great advantage. One consequence of all this for us as teachers of biblical literature is that our students will frequently show unusual powers in recognizing this type of artistry in the Hebrew writers.

In the study of Hebrew literary style we are peculiarly liable to approach our study from the point of view of the Occidental and particularly the Greek mind. It is not enough to speak of the "glory" or the "nobility" of Hebrew literature without making clear what we mean by such terms. When we say certain passages are *sublime*, however, we are employing a term which has been discussed ever since Longinus, who quoted as an illustration of the sublime "God said, 'Let there be light,' and there was light." Bishop Lowth and many others after him have felt the great sublimity of passages in the book of Job. It is not easy to define the word "sublimity," and we may content ourselves by paraphrasing the imitation by the suggestion that we should rather feel sublimity than know how to define it. By that norm surely we can all point to passages that to us are nothing short of sublime, precisely as we can all point to passages in the O. T. that arouse in us the sense of the Numinous, of the *mysterium tremendum* which is certainly related to the sublime. But we can not thus forsake the appointed task of literary study. If many of us today can express in intelligible terms something of the meaning of the category of the Holy, it is because Rudolf Otto has described it for us in classic language with profound learning and insight. Now it is our task to attempt to do for the literary category of the sublime what Otto has done for the religious category of the Holy. Further in our discussion of Hebrew literary style we shall do well not to quote Buffon's "*le style est l'homme même*" for it is the *people*, the Hebrew people, which is expressing itself in the O. T., more than the individual, who was late to emerge. What are the questions, then, that a study of literary style assigns to us? I think we may answer this best by raising questions while we read the great classics of literary criticism, especially such

works as Aristotle's *Poetics*, Longinus' treatise, Addison's *Essay on the Pleasures of the Imagination*, Arnold's *Essays in Criticism*, Pater's essays, and Conrad's remarkable preface to his *The Nigger of the Narcissus*. Sometimes indeed we shall encounter much that is not applicable to the literature of the Orient, but that too is important for by this means we shall gain a clearer notion of what the Bible really is as literature. At other times we shall meet literary canons that are universal in their application, certain touchstones that will serve us as guides in expressing the kind of greatness there is in Hebrew literature. But we shall learn best what Hebrew literary style is and what norms to apply to Hebrew literature by reading it again and again and yet again until we enter into the mentality of the authors, share their attitudes, and breathe their spirit. We shall thus learn not only that the narratives of Genesis are great literature but *why* they are so. Similarly, in reading Isaiah, Jeremiah, and the Psalms we shall certainly be exalted by what we read there, but our exaltation will be greater and nobler when criticism seasons spontaneous appreciation. What shall we say, for example, of the greatness of this little poem of Jeremiah's

I looked to the earth—and behold a chaos!
To the heavens—and their light was gone.
I looked to the hills, and lo, they quivered,
And the mountains shook.
I looked—and behold, no man was there,
And all the birds of heaven were flown.
I looked to the cornland—and lo, a desert,
And all its cities were razed away.

The supreme greatness of this creation can not be disposed of by a sweep of the pen. Here we have matchless form (even without Duhm's textual emendations!). Here we have sublimity that can find few parallels in literature. Here we have lines that Matthew Arnold would surely have styled immortal. Professor Skinner entitles it "A Vision of Chaos." It is certainly eschatological in meaning. The theme is one of cosmic scope, and it is couched in language of dignity and high seriousness.

To view Hebrew literature in something of its true proportions we must place it alongside of the other literatures of the world. Our method of study must be comparative. The literary student realizes very soon that all literature becomes grist for his mill. Contrast

may prove as suggestive as similarity, in fact more so. In our undergraduate courses we have long since suggested parallels with literature in the Western world, and this has doubtless proved helpful in stimulating student interest. We have contrasted Hebraism and Hellenism, utilizing perhaps the plentiful literature on this subject. How far we have actually employed the literature of Greece, I do not know. Doubtless some of us have compared the conceptions of justice of the Hebrew prophets with those of the Greek tragedians, or we have indulged in the phantasy of a symposium where Socrates and Second Isaiah shared their insights, or we have read from Plato's *Apology* in dealing with Jeremiah, or referred to the great philosopher whenever occasion suggested him to our minds. We have all, of course, had our classes read Aeschylus' *Prometheus Bound*, and study Horace Kallen's attractive little book on *The Book of Job as Greek Tragedy*. To set up a Hebrew classic among the classics of the world is no mean task, for it is not often that the Orient is given much space in the literary estimates of our historians of literature. And in our courses we have naturally employed the avenue of English literature as a convenient access to the literature of another civilization and culture. This method seems to me, however, to be fraught with quite obvious dangers. We have prided ourselves on making the prophets intensely modern and real to the student. We have attributed a Greek and western view of nature to the ancient Hebrews. We have implied that modern conceptions of *man* and *reason* and *beauty* are those of the O. T. and sometimes have gone to the extreme of styling these conceptions as Hebraic. But when we do this, are we not somehow reducing everything to a common denominator, with the tacit assumption that what is agreed upon is valuable? Like a similar group in the history of religion, those who make this emphasis have an intense aversion to stressing anything that is unique or different. The motives for this *reductio* are not necessarily the same, but they have much in common.

During the past few years I have gone increasingly to the literature of the Orient, and each year I find this more rewarding and suggestive. Hebrew literature finds itself in a natural setting among the literatures of the Near East. It is not only that intimate inter-

national relationships, commercial intercourse, geographical proximity, and racial kinship are reflected in the Bible; the style and character of Hebrew literature is much the same as those of the other nations. They share a common atmosphere of Oriental antiquity. Much of this comparative literature we doubtless use already: the Gilgamesh epic, the Amarna letters, the Code of Hammurabi, Ipuwer's "messianic" oracle, Ikhnaton's famous hymn on "The Splendor of Aton," the Arabian Nights, the Egyptian Wisdom literature, the Babylonian and Assyrian hymns and prayers. More recently the remarkable Phoenician Ras Shamra epic has come to us in several renderings, so that it is now available for use in our classes. And if one desires to increase his contacts with other literature, he will have no difficulty. The books and journals on Oriental studies are constantly making it accessible. In the meantime one may learn and gather much from such familiar volumes as Barton's *Archaeology and the Bible* (latest edition 1933), and Stephen Langdon's *Semitic Mythology* (Vol. V of *The Mythology of All Races*), Simpson's collection of essays, *The Psalmists*, Sir Flinders Petrie's collections of Egyptian tales, Breasted's *Ancient Records of Egypt*; Adolf Erman's *The Literature of the Ancient Egyptians*; Oesterley's commentary on the book of Proverbs (especially the introduction). In German the literature is extensive. Gunkel's work has already been named. To it should here be added Gressmann's *Alt-orientalische Texte und Bilder* and the admirable and important essays in the second edition of *Kultur der Gegenwart* (I, vii) on the oriental literatures.

There are other problems also that still remain for us, such as those relating to the writing of a history of Hebrew literature. The difficulties are, of course, apparent. But what with the important studies on social background and environment of O. T. times, the imposing and richly-illustrated volumes on Egypt, Assyria, Arabia, and Persia that are appearing periodically, the voluminous contributions of Gunkel and his followers, and the even more voluminous comparative materials which we may anticipate, the ground is broken, the seed is sown, and the critical work of cultivation has been begun.

Another subject that deserves detailed study and greater recognition is the writing of his-

tory among the Hebrews. There is nothing in the ancient Orient that can remotely compare with the accomplishment of the Hebrew genius here, and it is an accomplishment of the greatest consequence and importance in the history of civilization and culture. One would do well to read Eduard Meyer's comments on the subject in *Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme* and Professor Fowler's admirable article on "Herodotus and the Early Hebrew Historians" in the *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. XLIX. 1930, pp. 207-217.

The aesthetic literary study of the Bible can lose caste without making an effort to do so. When it becomes a method of criticism it runs the danger of going to excess, and we have sometimes seen this happen, I believe, in the case of the O. T. with the school of the criticism of literary types (*Gattungskritik*), and in

the case of the N. T. with the *Formgeschichte*. It is easy, too, for emphasis upon form to obtrude itself out of all proportion to appreciation of content. Unless one is forever alert to what is being said, "surfeiting, the appetite may sicken and so die." There is no such thing as "mere literature." Literature is concerned with matter as well as manner, with content as well as form. In the case of Israel's literature the content is of such an amazing nature and quality that millions of men have believed it divine revelation. To call it anything less would seem to them to call it something not less adequate but something untrue. The stress of this literature is prevailingly historic, but it is history of extraordinary vitality and power. And there runs through it passion, dignity, high-seriousness, sublimity, and truth.

THE SHORTCOMINGS OF THE SCIENTIFIC METHOD IN THE TEACHING OF THE BIBLE

PROFESSOR J. HOWARD HOWSON, *Department of Religion, Vassar College*

Those few of you who know my intellectual interests must be secretly amused at me for picking any flaws in the use of the scientific method. It is my firm belief that religion can not come into its own in our day, nor can the teaching of religion, until we as leaders in our field make the scientific method our own. The history of religions has been cursed by romanticism, heaping up an ensnaring mythology about religious insights, feeding the primitive gullibility of the unenlightened mind. Poetry is no substitute for sober fact. And the singing of outworn creeds does not thereby remove the falsity of their statements. The flight into the ethereal realm of values is no adequate compensation for the fact that we have tried to escape from the implications of our cosmological studies. In religion we need that passionate respect for authenticated facts, and for the verifiability of facts, which is such a characteristic trait of the natural scientist. Nevertheless, the evidence of experience leads me to warn against the dangers of a conscious use of the scientific method in the teaching of the Bible.

The scientific method, as you all know, involves roughly three processes. First, there is the observation of phenomena. Such and such is the indubitable evidence before us as

attested by reliable witnesses who were in a position to observe what they state they have observed. Second, there is the observation of relationships between these facts. This involves classification and the determination of casual sequence. Before any casual sequence is observable in the data before us, the facts observed are classified according to more or less superficial criteria of likeness and unlikeness. However, as soon as process is observable within the data the facts are classified according to their relationship to the demonstrated or believed process. For example, the data of biology are interesting bits of information on the natural history level until some evidence of development is observable. As soon as development is apparent, reclassification takes place in the light of the development. In science, facts do not have meaning except in relation to process. The third step in the scientific method is the development of an hypothesis that carries an observed relationship out into the unknown. At first a mere hunch, or conjecture, it is more precisely stated in the form of an hypothesis. As further research substantiates the validity of the hypothesis it becomes a theory. It may even reach the dignity of demonstrated fact; although some hypotheses, by their very nature,

must remain forever in the realm of the hypothetical, in the realm of the "as if."

Let us apply this method to the teaching of the Bible. The raw materials of our study are the writings of the Old and New Testaments as they are found in the English Bible in one of the standard versions. We assure our students of the essential reliability of the translation which we choose, reserving for ourselves the right to challenge certain interpretations which have controlled the translator at various points. We acquaint the students with the vicissitudes of the documents in the course of history. We have before us a translation, which in the main we accept, from irrecoverable originals, which have suffered tremendously in transmission, but to what degree we are not able to determine to our own satisfaction. Nevertheless, when we study this material with its confessed inaccuracies we find an enormous body of more or less reliable writings. These are of various sorts, some historical, some prophetic, some poetic.

When we examine the historical writings, for example, we have to ask ourselves, "Does this material hang together?" We discover in Genesis that it does not. By a consideration of literary criteria we delineate the different accounts, recognizing, at the same time, that while J and E are two different accounts there are times when we can not distinguish one from the other. After we have found J in its most certain portions and disregarded the debatable passages, we have left the problem of determining under what circumstances it was written. Under such circumstances what is its reliability as an historic document? By the time we have finished we are many degrees removed from certainty. Our hypotheses are colored by our philosophy of history, our knowledge of the history of religions, and our acquaintance with the current literature of historical speculation.

Nor is the difficulty avoided in the New Testament. The gospels were the works of propagandists bent on marshalling the evidence at their disposal to prove that Jesus the historical figure was also in every respect the Christ of their faith. We do not know how much credence to give to the fourth gospel. We do not know how much of the evidence of the gospels is unhistorical. We may accept certain canons of interpretation and say, for example, that those aspects of the gospel story are true

that run counter to the theological emphases of the period in which the gospels grew up. Such a procedure gives us a kernel of historical fact acceptable to most historians; but it is a meager enough crumb to give the student to whom Jesus has been the Lord of Life.

Such treatment may be appropriate for the mature student trained in historical research. It is quite unfair to the immature student who has not the benefit of historical training. He is impressed more by the fine weighing of probability that is so characteristic of the careful historian. The process has not merely destroyed the infallibility of the Bible, it has made of the Bible a book too unreliable to be concerned with. Furthermore, the instructor is thought of as one who has destroyed, one by one, the firm bases on which his faith was built. In spite of the instructor's faith in those historical facts which have survived because they have been so thoroughly tested, the student is inclined to resent the thoroughness with which the citadel of faith has been assaulted.

I make no plea for a less rigorous search for truth. I call for a closer examination of the teaching situation and of the scientific method to see if we can not be loyal to the demands of truth while giving to our students a more positive impression of religion and of the part the Bible plays in our life.

A closer examination of the scientific method shows that our analysis has not been complete. Science does not begin with a body of facts. It begins with an interest and a question. The data observed are first of all relevant to an interest, and later relevant to a question. Science is not the mere elaboration of naive curiosity feasting on new sense data. Science is the marshalling of facts that seem to have relevance, followed by a search for the ultimate reasons for such relevance. The very facts observed, therefore, are conditioned by the question in the searcher's mind, and the scientific method is not complete until the question has been satisfactorily answered. In pure science the question that is asked is philosophical. The search is for an answer to a question with regard to the nature of things. In applied science the question is practical. The search is for an answer to a problem in technique. Obviously the two can not be kept separate. Each contributes to the other. Pure science discovers valuable techniques in the art

of living. Applied science uncovers data which pure science welcomes as throwing a flood of light on the nature of reality. But in every research of pure or applied science there is an interest to be satisfied and a question to be answered.

When it is realized that scientific research is the outcome of an interest and a question it behooves the teacher with a high regard to scientific truth to examine the nature of his interest in his subject matter and the question he is asking. I once knew of a student of Semitics who expressed surprise at any one being interested in such a subject who was not preparing to teach it. Is our interest in the Bible of primary or secondary concern to us? Do we find the study of the Bible so fascinating that it gives added zest to living? Do we find our thoughts reverting to it in pleasant reverie when our attention is relaxed and we take our ease? I doubt very much if the interest we arouse in our students will be any stronger than that which we ourselves bring to the subject.

Our interest focuses in a question. What is the question we ask of the Bible? The question we ask will determine what facts we pay attention to and what hypotheses we develop. If I ask, as I approach the Bible, "What historical sequence seems to be most probable as a result of the study of these books?" I come out with a set of observed relationships and hypotheses. On the other hand, if I ask "What is the religious development within the Bible?" I may have to pay attention to the same facts but my emphasis will be different, and my conclusions and hypotheses will be different, although harmonious with the hypotheses of the previous research.

In the organization of departments of Religion, or of courses of religion, there is the temptation to plan the courses so that factual material is given in the more elementary courses and the philosophic material in the more advanced courses. Such treatment is justified only when we can hold a single group over the period of time necessary to complete the synthesis. However, when a significant percentage of students takes but one course in the department one owes it to one's subject matter to reveal to the students in that course, elementary though it may be, the potential significance of the material with which one is dealing. It is not fair to the Bible to derive

from it merely an historical sequence. It portrays in unparalleled fashion the developing religious experience of mankind. Not until the story of that development is unfolded in such a way that its significance is caught by the student, has justice been done to the subject matter. Can this be done in a course of but one year's duration? Yes, if we know what we are about and are willing to omit less important matters for the more important. To draw a picture in a few bold strokes does not necessarily do injustice to the person whose portrait it is. To draw in great detail a partial portrait may be truer to the part portrayed; but is a gross travesty on the original unless the character of the whole can be inferred from the part. Have we in our preoccupation with the scientific method, drawn with great care all the features but the eyes?

Let's be scientific—really scientific—and recognize our own interest in our subject matter and the questions we believe are answered in its study. Let's share this interest with our classes at the very beginning of our study. Let us tell them what it means to us. This declaration of interest may awaken in the students a similar enthusiasm which will grow with the study of the Bible, provided the instruction is so arranged that they have a chance to observe the facts that have given the Bible such significance for us.

One step further. Since scientific research begins with an interest and a question, why should a scientific treatment of the Bible not begin with the interests of the students and their questions? Even before we have declared our own interest in the Bible would it not be wise to ascertain the interests of our students and the questions they would like to have answered as they come to the study of the Bible? Where individual research is possible a course can be outlined in which those facts are studied which bear most directly on the individual problem. At any rate a truly scientific treatment of the Bible should recognize the interests of the students as of primary importance, and should so organize study that their burning questions are answered. This can not be done unless the instructor's experience parallels that of his students, or unless the instructor knows his students intimately.

In short, in our efforts to be scientific we have gone only half the way of the scientific method. We have exalted facts above their

significance. We have begun in the middle of a process and stopped short of its consummation. We have suppressed the frank confession of the source of our interest in our subject. We have been indifferent to the interests of our students. Our so-called scien-

tific attitude has checked our enthusiasms, neutralized our personalities and devitalized the subject matter. The cure is not a return to sentimentality or piety but a more thoroughgoing acceptance of the implications of scientific research.

THE PLACE OF THE BIBLE IN THE COLLEGE CURRICULUM

PROFESSOR HENRY T. FOWLER, *Brown University*

We have been hearing of a variety of scholarly approaches to the Bible. Our Symposium really began yesterday, did it not, with the literary approach presented by Miss Wilson and the archaeological approach as the subject of the evening? The latter would seem to be one of the most popular avenues today, judging from the space the newspapers have been giving to archaeological discoveries, especially since the uncovering of Tutenkhamon's tomb, ten years ago.

Now we are to consider the question: By what roads does the Bible approach the college and find its appropriate place therein?

It is a little difficult, perhaps, to talk about the proper place of anything in such a fluid medium as an American college curriculum. We may, however, discover something of the direction of flow, despite confusing eddies and cross currents. The most obvious influence in directing the general current of the curriculum in the last twenty-odd years was, I think, President Lowell's Inaugural, of 1909, with its slogan "men who know a little of everything, and something well." The next year Harvard, abandoning her thirty years of almost complete freedom of election, promulgated her system of "concentration and distribution." While many colleges today still seek distribution by prescribing specific subjects, many have adopted the Harvard method of distribution by required election from each of three or four, or more, groups of kindred subjects—as a science group, a language and literature group, a history and social science group. The other requirement, that of concentration in some one field, is now almost universal. Roughly, we may say that from one quarter to one half of the student's time is usually prescribed, either by specific subjects or choice from groups, while another quarter or more must be devoted to concentration, leaving

from one quarter to one half open for free election.

All this has, I find, considerable bearing on the place of the Bible in the curriculum. And all this presents quite a different situation from that prevailing, say in the nineties and the opening decade of the new century, when so many of our modern biblical departments were being established.

Early in the present century, in 1906 to be exact, I chanced to make some examination of the historic and the current place of the Bible in the American college. I noted, of course, the fact that for the first 151 years of Harvard's corporate life, Hebrew was a required study; later to be "offered for those who desire it," in the phrase of the catalogue. At Yale in 1858 Hebrew was displaced in the list of college optional courses by "practical surveying!". Already at Harvard, required lectures on the Greek Testament had given place to "lectures on the means of preserving health!" Apparently utilitarian interests were becoming dominant in the 1840's and 50's and the Bible, read in its original languages, was being crowded out of college; though the Greek Testament held its place long afterward in many institutions. Unless my memory plays me false, it was a required study at Princeton almost to the end of the 19th century. The English Bible had found little or no place in the regular, week-day curriculum prior to the late 1880's.

With the development of graduate study in the last quarter of the century and with the interest aroused by the discovery of the fascinating parallels to the Genesis narratives in cuneiform literature, chairs of Semitic history and literature were being established in our universities.

Then the progress of interest in the historico-literary study of the Old Testament led the Semitic departments to reach out into the

undergraduate field. Doubtless the newly revised translation of the entire Bible, making it possible to do fairly scholarly work on the basis of the English text, had a part in this movement.

It was in 1886 that Yale called William R. Harper to her University chair of Semitic languages. Two years later, the Woolsey Chair of Biblical Literature was established in the College, and Dr. Harper was invited to add undergraduate instruction to his graduate teaching.

So far as I can judge, the real era of the English Bible in the American College curriculum began with the establishment of that Woolsey Chair at Yale in 1888.

Very soon, the women's colleges, especially, caught the enthusiasm. I note, for example, that it was in 1891 that George A. Barton became Professor of Biblical Literature and Semitic Languages at Bryn Mawr, and in 1893 that Irving F. Wood became Professor of Biblical Literature and Ethics at Smith.

Eighteen years had gone by since the establishment of the Woolsey Chair in 1883, when I looked over the field in 1906. I then found the larger, endowed universities, for the most part, treating their English Bible work as a part of the Semitic department, while many of the separate colleges, those which were not constituent parts of universities, had established biblical chairs, often with the term Biblical Literature appearing in their titles.

The Bible, driven out of the undergraduate course on the old linguistic approach, was coming back on the historico-literary basis.

With this background in mind, I have been interested in recent weeks in looking over a considerable range of catalogues of colleges and universities, from Maine to California, and south at least as far as Carolina and Tennessee. My examination can lay no claim to statistical completeness, but my observations are, I trust, based on sufficient data to give some fairly accurate impressions as to the present place of the Bible in our college curricula and as to some of the changes in the last quarter century.

One change is very manifest—a great increase in the number of institutions offering work in the English Bible on a truly collegiate basis. In this Association of ours, for example, I find represented in the membership some 82 colleges of liberal arts, or universities con-

taining such colleges. Presumably there are many more institutions, among the 438 approved colleges and universities, that offer biblical courses for undergraduates; but without counting too much on these, it is safe to say that the number has been multiplied several times in the last twenty-five years.

The second obvious change that has occurred in this period brings us to a real question about which much of yesterday's discussion circled. It is the transition from the emphasis upon the study of the Bible as literature, as the main subject of a college department, to the emphasis upon religion as the main subject of study, under which the Bible is subsumed.

As I look over the official titles of our departments in the different colleges, it proves difficult to generalize; they offer such bewildering variety. I find Bible courses offered in a Department of Religion; of English Bible and Religion; of Biblical Literature and History; of Biblical Literature, alone; of Semitic Languages and Literatures and Oriental History; of Ethics and Christian Evidences; History and Literature of Religion; Bible and Christian Religion; Religion and Biblical Literature; Biblical Languages and Literature; Biblical History, Literature, and Interpretation; or even offered in a department of English Language and Literature, and so on, *ad indefinitum*.

Well, at least we are not so standardized as to be reduced to a dead level—our finger prints are individual.

Trying to find some order in this apparently hopeless variety of opinion as to the place of the Bible in the curriculum, I find the term Bible, or biblical, and the term religion, or religious, occurring with almost equal frequency in the names of the departments. I find myself sometimes puzzled over the use of the term religion in these titles. I think that it sometimes means a group of phenomena that may be considered from a philosophical or sociological view-point, or again is a title for some courses that are thought of chiefly as valuable for the cultivation of personal religion.

Names of departments may be misleading, lagging behind change of content or *vice versa*; apparently the emphasis in the program of courses does not always coincide with the title of the department. At one high-grade

women's college, the name of the department is Religion, and Religion is grouped with the social sciences rather than languages and literatures, but the two courses offered under the heading seem to be primarily courses in Biblical Literature. At a famous men's college, not, as it happens, represented in our membership, the only course offered under the departmental heading religion is introduction to the literature of the Old and New Testaments. At another excellent college, the department is named Biblical Literature, and a full line of biblical courses is offered, including Hebrew and Greek Testament; but the work of the department is grouped with Art, Philosophy, and Psychology, rather than with the other literatures.

The Bible, dropped from the colleges as a philological subject, began to come back about forty-four years ago as a study of literature and its associated history. If formal grouping had been in vogue in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, biblical study would probably have been placed, in most cases, in the literature group.

Formal grouping is not yet sufficiently universal to make generalization as to the present group placement of the Bible very satisfactory; but, so far as I have observed, the institutions that have adopted grouping generally classify the study of the Bible with history and the social sciences, or sometimes with Philosophy, if Philosophy is not included with the social sciences.

In a large college, where the department bears the name simply Religion, and where its courses are included in the Social Science group, the catalogue states that the subject is treated from different angles—literary, historical, psychological, philosophical, and that the students may select their courses in the department with a view to emphasizing one or another of these aspects of the subject. Such an arrangement would seem to be practicable only in a rather large department with several professors.

In some institutions where Biblical Literature is still central in the department, subjects from the more general field of religion have been added, such as the history of religion, psychology of religion, religious education. In a few institutions, a general historical back-

ground course in Oriental history has been included in the work of the department.

From these observations as to the actual, present-day place of the Bible in the curriculum as inferred from the title of the department in which it appears, the nature of the courses offered, and its grouping with other departments, we may turn to the extent of academic recognition given to the courses. On the whole, I have been happily surprised in my recent examination to see in how many institutions it is possible to major or concentrate or work for honors in the field of the Bible or religion; and again, to find the department so included within the group system that the subject may be chosen for distribution early in the college course. I had supposed that in more cases it would be treated as an incidental, supernumerary subject, counted only in the free election list, to be chosen by those who found a chance to fill it in some chink that happened to be open in their individual programs.

Among those institutions which prescribe a considerable list of specific subjects, I gain the impression that fewer than formerly include the Bible as a requirement. I may be wrong in this. The impression may come from the fact that some institutions which formerly included the subject in a list of required courses have adopted the group plan of requirements. In any case, in some prominent colleges, there are still required courses of one or two semesters in our field.

Such examination as I have been able to make clearly indicates a great variety of opinion as to the proper approach of the Bible to the curriculum and its true place therein.

Forty-four years ago the English Bible began to find a new place in the American college as a study of literature with emphasis upon the historical setting and development of that literature. That is now the conception of the place of the Bible in the curriculum of many institutions, although there may have been attached to the department courses dealing with various phases of the study of religion as such.

On the other hand, in many institutions, the study of the Bible is now placed as a sub-topic in a department of religion, religion being treated as chiefly a subject of sociological or philosophical interest, so far as it is really a subject for intellectual investigation.

A very few institutions, we have noted, are able and willing to recognize the different approaches to the Bible as giving it more than one appropriate place in the curriculum.

Under which classification is it most likely to "live long and prosper" in the colleges? That is, perhaps, a question which must be determined by individual and local conditions. Those of us who fought, and sometimes bled, in the earlier days for the right to study and teach the Bible as literature may feel anxious about the future when we see many institutions turning away from what was for us, a hard-won vantage point. Those who have

come more recently into the work may be more likely to feel that recent changes mark progress.

However great the confusion of present practice may seem to be, my partial survey of the field assures me that the past quarter-century has showed very great advance in the recognition by college authorities that the Bible is entitled to *some* place in the curriculum, and that it is now given a much fairer chance than twenty-five years ago in the struggle for life among the many vital subjects that compete for the time and interest of our surfeited undergraduates.

EDITORIAL

The Annual Meeting

Elsewhere in this issue of the JOURNAL is an announcement of the Annual Meeting of NABI. The program has been arranged by an efficient committee and deals with a vital theme; it will be interesting and stimulating. The accession to our numbers will no doubt show itself in a larger attendance and the exhilarating influence of new blood. Some of us, may think that we cannot afford the expense during this period of financial stress. But it is exactly at a time like this that we need the inspirational contact with others most. It will therefore not be out of place to enforce this invitation with the scriptural injunction: "Not forsaking our own assembling together as the custom of some is."

The Journal's Reception

The publication of the JOURNAL was a venture. It was, indeed, needed and wanted, but what assurance was there that it could thrive in such a time as this? Consequently, the first part was sent forth with the announcement that if its reception warranted it, it would be followed by a second part. The reception of the JOURNAL has exceeded all our expectations, and here is the second part. The outlook for the future is bright. The Librarian of the State University of Iowa sent in a three years' subscription for the JOURNAL; of course, we accepted the challenge; and we are bound to live up to it. Prior to the publication of the JOURNAL, our membership was

alarmingly on the decline; since its publication, our secretary, Prof. Purinton, reports about a hundred members have been added, which means an increase of sixty per cent. And the movement has only just begun. With the momentum gained and the personal cooperation of our membership, we should not be satisfied until every instructor in Bible and religion is enrolled.

Virtually without exception, expressions conveying reactions on the character of the initial number of the JOURNAL have been friendly and hearty. The following excerpts illustrate views from different angles:

"It is interesting and also attractive in form."
George Dahl.

"I enjoyed very much the reviews published in the first number, and think this is a fine feature of a consummately fine periodical. Keep up the quality set in this first number, and the JOURNAL will win a high place in the esteem of biblical instructors."
John W. Flight.

"I am personally very much interested in the JOURNAL . . . Certainly it should be in the library of Auburn Theological Seminary."

Harry Lathrop Reed.

"After reading the first number of the JOURNAL . . . I cannot refrain from expressing my enthusiastic approval of the JOURNAL and its contents. It is splendid. I read it through from cover to cover as soon as it was received . . . Only continue as you have started, and keep the catholicity of outlook

and content which is so striking a feature of the first number."

W. F. Albright, Jerusalem.

The National Association of Biblical Instructors and the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis

The phenomenal growth of NABI has caused apprehension that it might affect unfavorably SBL; and a friend of both has written to say that "some of the members of the older society regard with apprehension the probable financial effect of the new venture on the Society of Biblical Literature."

If there were real grounds for such an apprehension, none would regret it more than those most closely associated with NABI; but fortunately there are none. If there is a decline in the membership of SBL, it must be due to other causes. Our secretary states that only a negligible number of the SBL members have shown any interest in the JOURNAL; and that we did have about 20 members who also belonged to the SBL, but this number has not increased greatly.

We have no way of knowing whether any member of SBL substituted that membership for that of NABI. If there are such, they could not have understood the objects for which the two associations are standing. For this reason as well as for the sake of mutual understanding, it will not be out of place to re-state the varying objects as we understand them.

NABI is now in the 24th year of its existence. It was founded by active members of SBL, like Charles Foster Kent, Henry T. Fowler, and Irving F. Wood. The meetings and programs were arranged with a view to avoiding any clash of interests; and each society went its own independent way. The publication of the JOURNAL has introduced no new departure in principle; and it is admitted that it makes no conflict in subject matter.

SBL has for its primary object technical and creative research. When it celebrated its fiftieth anniversary, Prof. Nathaniel Schmidt, in his historical survey of the society, quoted the call to its first meeting, to be "for the purpose of promoting a thorough study of the Scriptures by reading and discussing of original papers." By adhering to this object the society has grown in value and international

esteem. Its meetings have never been more largely attended. There is not sufficient time for all the papers offered, although there is now a division into Old and New Testament sections. This is gratifying evidence that the society is functioning. And this is fortunate; for unless there were a society to perform this stimulating task, biblical science in America might languish and pass away. SBL, then, need have no fear of a rival: it is virile and well able to take care of itself.

NABI has a mission of its own. To it fall matters relating to pedagogy and education. It deals with methods and contents of courses of study, and the application of religion to character building.

It becomes thus evident that each of these societies has its own field; they mutually supplement each other; and both are needed. The attempt to blend the two might be disastrous to both. And if there is room for an American Oriental Society with its journal, there is room for NABI with its journal.

Our friendly correspondent asks: "How the support of the SBL and its JOURNAL can be maintained, and in particular how the members of NABI can be encouraged not to discontinue their membership in SBL?"

We reply: The activity of SBL is of fundamental importance to biblical science and for that reason a concern of the members of NABI. In it are the roots of the tree of biblical knowledge, and to cut away from the root would invite the risk of being left dead branches. It thus becomes a matter of self preservation for the members of NABI to keep SBL alive. And in proportion as this is realized, NABI members will not only not sever their connection with SBL, but on the contrary, become its active promoters; and many a member of NABI, starting with one type of interest, may end up with embracing the other; and thus NABI itself will become a feeder to SBL.

SBL can thus well afford to be generous toward NABI. There is a Proverb: "There is that scattereth, and increaseth yet more." To put it in Toy's translation:

"One man spends, yet still increases,
Another withholds what is proper, but (it tends) only to want.

The liberal man will be prospered,
And he who waters will himself be watered."

Ismar J. Peritz.

The Annual Meeting — Tentative Program

Report by PROF. ELMER W. K. MOULD, *Chairman of the Program Committee*

It is the plan of the program committee that our annual meeting should open at 10 a. m. on Wednesday, December 27th, at the Union Theological Seminary, with the presidential address by Dean James Muilenburg: "The Legacy of Israel and Our Heritage in a Time of Crisis."

Following the address the program calls for committee reports and business, followed by luncheon at the refectory cafeteria.

For the afternoon session, commencing at 2 o'clock, the plan is for a series of papers on Teaching the New Testament, as follows:

"Teaching the Synoptic Gospels," Henry J. Cadbury, of Bryn Mawr.

"Teaching the Pauline Epistles," Rollin H. Walker, of Ohio Wesleyan.

"Teaching Apocalyptic, with Special Reference to Revelation," Amos H. Wilder, until recently of Hamilton College; now of Andover-Newton Seminary.

"Teaching the Fourth Gospel," Mary Ely Lyman, Barnard College.

"Teaching the New Testament for Relig-

ious Values," Ernest Findlay Scott, of Union Theological Seminary.

"Ethical Emphases in Teaching the New Testament," James Clelland, Amherst College.

"Educational Values to be Achieved in Teaching the New Testament."

"The New Testament and the Pre-college Student."

The readers have been asked to make their papers 15 minutes in length. This will afford time for discussion by the group.

It is planned that there will be the customary dinner party in the private dining room of the refectory at 6.30 p. m. Following the dinner party, we hope to have two features: An address on "Re-thinking Our Aims as Biblical Instructors," and an illustrated lecture on "Archaeology and the New Testament."

These features will close the program. After these evening addresses the association may transact any business that needs to be done, or, if preferred, the association can defer business to a Thursday morning session for which there would be time between 9 a. m. and 10.30 a. m., at which time the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis convenes.

Members of the Association *

Prof. May A. Allen, Ph. D., Newcomb College, New Orleans, La.

Prof. Harvie Branscomb, Ph. D., Duke University, Durham, N. C.

Prof. Howard H. Brinton, Ph. D., Mills College, Mills College, Calif.

Rev. J. F. Eddins, B. D., Clinton, La.

Rev. William Mefford Fouts, Th. D. (Northern Baptist Theological Seminary), 3040 W. Washington Blvd., Station D., Chicago, Ill.

Rev. Frank H. Hallock, S. T. D., Nashotah House, Nashotah, Wis.

Miss May E. Hancock (Gordon College), 30 Evans Way, Boston, Mass.

Prof. S. Ralph Harlow, Ph. D. (Smith), 307 Prospect Hts., Northampton, Mass.

Prof. John Harden Hicks, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas.

Prof. John W. Horine, D. D., Lutheran Theological Southern Seminary, Route 22, Columbia, S. C.

Prof. L. W. Irwin, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Va.

Rev. Frank M. Kerr, D. D., First Presbyterian Church, Hempstead, N. Y.

Prof. George Lang, D. D., LL. D., University of Alabama, University, Ala.

Rev. S. Burman Long, 608 Willis Ave., Syracuse, N. Y.

Rev. Julian Price Love (Presbyterian Theological Seminary), 2119 Napoleon Blvd., Louisville, Ky.

Rev. Henry Moehling Jr. (Dean, Lutheran School of Christian Education), 1452 No. 59th St., Philadelphia, Pa.

Prof. Lloyd Morris, B. D. (Coe College), 124 Center Point Road, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

Prof. Charles H. Patterson, Ph. D., University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Neb.

Pres. Harry Lathrop Reed, D. D., Auburn Theological Seminary, Auburn, N. Y.

* Added to association since May 22, 1933. Members of association are requested to notify the Secretary-Treasurer, Carl E. Purlington, 13 Avon Place, Hempstead, N. Y., of any corrections or changes of address.

Prof. Corwin C. Roach, Bexley Hall of Kenyon College, Gambier, Ohio.
 Miss A. Kathryn Rogers, Northfield Seminary, E. Northfield, Mass.
 Prof. W. Gordon Ross, B. D., Berea College, Berea College Station, Ky.
 Prof. C. T. Ryan, A. M., Ed. M. (Kearney State Teachers' College), Box 423, Kearney, Neb.
 Mr. Charles W. Scheid, B. D., Mount Hermon School, Mount Hermon, Mass.
 Prof. Frederick A. Schilling, Ph. D., Walla Walla College, College Place, Wash.
 Prof. F. W. Schneider, Morningside College, Sioux City, Iowa.
 Prof. Charles F. Sitterly, Drew University, Madison, N. J.
 Rev. Wilbur M. Smith, D. D. (The Presbyterian Church of Coatesville), 359 E. Lincoln Highway, Coatesville, Pa.
 Prof. C. W. Sommerville, Ph. D. (Queens-Chicora College), 227 E. Park Ave., Charlotte, N. C.
 Prof. Daniel W. Terry, Cazenovia Seminary, Cazenovia, N. Y.
 Prof. June Wallace (Macalaster College), 112 Cambridge Ave., St. Paul, Minn.
 Mr. Henry T. Ware, State Teachers' College, Hattiesburg, Miss.
 Prof. J. M. Wells, Hillsdale College, Hillsdale, Mich.

Prof. Edward S. Worcester, B. D., D. D. (New Brunswick Theological Seminary), 3 Seminary Place, New Brunswick, N. J.
 Prof. W. W. Martin, 1810 East Belmont Circle, Nashville, Tenn.
 Miss Frances W. Smith, 7739 Eastlake Terrace, Chicago, Ill.
 Prof. Reuben A. Goodman, (Newberry College), 2102 College Street, Newberry, S. C.

LIBRARY SUBSCRIPTIONS

Andover - Harvard Theological Seminary, Cambridge, Mass.
 Episcopal Theological School Library, 99 Brattle St., Cambridge, Mass.
 General Theological Seminary Library, Chelsea Square, New York, N. Y.
 The Library, Flora Stone Mather College, 11130 Bellflower Rd., Cleveland, Ohio.
 The Louisville Presbyterian Seminary Library, 109 East Broadway, Louisville, Ky.
 Schaufler Memorial Library, The Northfield Schools, Mount Hermon, Mass.
 School of Religion, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.
 Union Theological Seminary Library, Broadway at 120th St., New York, N. Y.
 Vassar College Library, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
 Meredith College Library, Raleigh, N. C.
 The Library, Auburn Theological Seminary, Seminary Campus, Auburn, N. Y.

BOOK REVIEWS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

THE TEACHINGS OF JESUS—A textbook for College and Individual Use. By *Harvie Branscomb*. Nashville, Tenn. Cokesbury Pr., 1931, 384 pp. \$2.50.

Professor Branscomb's "*The Teachings of Jesus*" is a distinct addition to American theological literature. The author is eminently well qualified for his task not only by wide familiarity with the literature of his subject but by genuine religious insight and appreciation and a well-balanced judgment. Unlike many books on the teachings of Jesus which devote themselves to some special phase of the the teachings such as social or ethical, the author treats the whole body of our Lord's teaching. Three chapters are devoted to the

Kingdom of God and its righteousness, a chapter to the meaning of the law of love, and another to humility, sincerity and courage. Chapters are also devoted to Jesus' teaching on possessions, on family life, to Jesus' teaching concerning prayer, the Jewish Scriptures, the Temple, the Gentiles, to Jesus' conception of Himself, and to his originality and authority. It thus contains much that many such treatises omit, dealing with the inner core as well as the practical application of the Master's teaching. The book is arranged as a text book and at the end of each chapter additional topics are suggested for the student's investigation, together with supplementary readings in other books. The book can be heartily

recommended. It ought to be in every college and seminary library.

George A. Barton

University of Pennsylvania

THE LIFE OF JESUS. By Maurice Goguel. Translated by Olive Wyon. The Macmillan Co., 1933. 591 pp. \$6.00.

Though there be many recent lives of Christ, not since Klausner's of 1925 has there appeared a work of so solid value as Goguel's which now lies before us in an English translation from the French of just a year ago. But not even Klausner's, although deserving the recognition it has received, is quite as of high quality. Goguel's is distinguished by a freedom from polemic interests and a stronger grasp on the problems of Gospel criticism. His outstanding contribution is his deliberate rejection of the *formgeschichtliche* hypothesis and his thorough-going application of the Two-Document theory in dealing with the Gospel tradition. This may seem reactionary, but it is not so. Goguel writes with a full knowledge of Bultmann's claims. But it has become increasingly evident that it is but a passing phase in Gospel criticism. And fortunately so for it makes a historical life of Jesus impossible. Goguel quotes Bultmann: "We can no longer know the character of Jesus, His life, or His personality . . . there is not one of His words which we can regard as purely authentic."

Take one illustration: the question of the mutual attitude of Jesus and the Pharisees. According to Riddle (Jesus and the Pharisees, p. 177) who writes from the *formgeschichtliche* point of view, ". . . there is no possible place in the experiences of Jesus for the conflicts with the Pharisees to have occurred as they are described, it is possible, once attention is directed to the Christian movement, to find exactly the places in the experiences of the Christian leaders and groups for just those conflicts to have taken place." In contrast Goguel (p. 346), "Their (i. e. the Pharisees) hostility is still more evident when they accuse Jesus of blasphemy . . . when they reproach Him with breaking the sabbath . . . still more clearly when they accuse Him of casting out demons by Beelzebub."

What is here involved is whether there is any historical basis for a life of Jesus in the

Gospels. Schmiedel, who was regarded as one of the most radical of Gospel critics, held the antagonistic attitude of the Pharisees as part of the very "foundation-pillars" of Gospel tradition. The *formgeschichtliche Schule* takes hold of these pillars and shakes them, Samson-like, so as to bring the whole structure into ruin. It is to Goguel's credit to hold Gospel criticism to its historical foundations. He is abreast of his times and one of the best illustrations of the constructive type of European New Testament scholarship. Goguel's Life of Jesus is an up-to-date standard work; and no biblical instructor can afford to neglect it. Syracuse University Ismar J. Peritz

THE RESURRECTION OF JESUS. By Selby Vernon McCasland. Thomas Nelson and Sons. N. Y. 1932. Pp. 219. \$2.00.

The time was ripe for a new treatise on this subject. Since Bowen's "The Resurrection in the New Testament" (1911), progress has been made in the understanding of the origin of the sources of the accounts in the Gospels. The author is well equipped for the task by a considerable residence in Germany, a comprehensive knowledge of the most recent literature, and a strictly scientific method. Those who look for a defense of a bodily resurrection will be disappointed; but those who believe in the Living Christ will find here a reasonable account of the origin and development of the Gospel narratives.

The starting point is the vision of Peter. This the author takes as "that radical experience out of which the Christian church has arisen," although as yet not fully explicable. Out of this experience, the author explains, the faith in "Jesus the Christ"; "On the Third Day;" and "The Lord's Day," as so many stages in the development in making the experience fit in with the faith and the cult life of the early church. But it had yet another effect. The significance of the resurrection of Jesus was seen in his example of heroic martyrdom, in proving that he was the Christ and the Son of God, that His death had redemptive, sacramental, and cosmic meaning, and that it answers the quest for immortality.

The author is a disciple of the *formgeschichtliche Schule*. That is, he assumes that the Gospels do not contain so much history as what the early church made it out to be under the influence of the cults of the mediterranean

world. This point of view, although more plausible for the resurrection narratives than for the earlier parts of the Gospels, is by no means as yet generally accepted by foremost New Testament scholarship, as may be seen in Goguel's *Life of Jesus*, reviewed in another column of this issue.

Nevertheless, Prof. McCasland has made a valuable contribution to the subject. He himself would be far from saying that it is the final word. The treatment is clear and frank; and no biblical scholar can afford to neglect it. Syracuse University *Ismar J. Peritz*

DER ELOHIST ALS ERZÄHLER, EIN IRRWEG DER PENTATEUCH-KRITIK? *Volz, P. and Rudolph W.* 1933 (Z. A. W. Beiheft 63).

Those teachers who have their students mark the documents of the Pentateuch with colored pencils can now dispense with at least one of the colors. A few brackets will take its place. The book here under consideration has in fact dealt a telling blow at the whole documentary hypothesis as it has commonly been received. Volz examines Genesis 1-36 and Rudolph chapters 37-50, and neither finds any evidence for the existence of a separate Elohist narrative running parallel to J. Volz exposes the failure of the critics to reach unanimity in their analysis of JE and shows that there has been a significant growth of scepticism on the subject in recent publications. The dissection of the narratives, he maintains, leaves us with fragments which, from the literary point of view, are inferior to the present text. (Repetitions, for example, which have a definite artistic purpose and effect are eliminated. Variety of vocabulary and phraseology, in which a writer's skill appears, is destroyed by the assumption that J always uses one word and E another.) The religious value of the stories is impaired. The facts which have given rise to the source-hypothesis are not denied, but Volz insists that they are to be treated exactly as similar phenomena are treated in the prophetic and other books of the Old Testament, and that none of them requires resort to the hypothesis of two independent histories. The difficulties are discussed, chapter by chapter, and the attempt is made to explain each one as due to (a) textual corruption, (b) revision or interpolation in J, or (c) the use of variant traditions by J himself. The reasons given

for splitting up many of the passages between J and E are shown to be very weak. Sometimes, as in chapter 22, the evidence for attributing a whole passage to E is weighted and found wanting. (Chapter 20 is explained as a later addition, a combination and rewriting of the similar stories in 12 and 26 for the purpose of producing a more edifying story. Why the other stories were not omitted when this was done is not explained. Such passages as 35:1-7 are attributed to a reviser, perhaps the Deuteronomist.) The argument is detailed and on the whole convincing.

Rudolph's discussion of the Joseph story does not make quite such a good impression. Difficulties are dismissed too lightly, especially in chapter 37. (Dothan and Shechem, to be sure, may have appeared together in the original narrative as they do now. The assumption that Judah was the one who saved Joseph's life in J and Reuben in E is weakened by the necessity of supposing that an editor substituted Judah's name for Reuben's in v. 22, but it is strengthened by the similar parallel between Reuben's role in 42:37 and Judah's in 43:8-10 ;44:14ff. Rudolph minimizes the significance of this. But the curious way in which the Ishmaelites and Midianites come into the story surely indicates some kind of conflation. To be told that when Joseph's brothers were about to take him from the pit and sell him to the Ishmaelites they were anticipated by a passing band of Midianites, who did what the brothers had proposed, puts altogether too much strain on our credulity.) Perhaps the hypothesis of two variant editions of J and an editorial combination of the two would meet the requirements of the case better than either the current theory or Rudolph's position. At any rate the evidence for an independent parallel narrative seems very slight.

That P as well as E was no more than a reviser and interpolator, so far as Genesis is concerned, is maintained by Volz in an appendix to his part of the book. Such passages as Gen. 1, 9:1-12, 17, 28:1-9, and 35:9-15 are of course no part of J, but they are theological compositions, says Volz, not narratives in the sense in which he uses the term. Chapter 23—and here the reviewer joyfully assents—is not P at all but J. The flood story is not a combination of two documents but a reworking of J for liturgical use in the New Year's festival (we shall soon have enough

New Year's liturgies to last the year round!). Here the argument seems to break down. The combination of incongruous data in our flood narrative is explicable only on the hypothesis of two written accounts. (While Volz does not discuss Exodus, we may remark that the story of the plagues also demands the assumption of written sources). Volz says that a compiler would leave out such contradictory items, but he can explain their retention by the reviser only by suggesting that the text may have been too well known and revered to allow the excision of parts of it, an explanation which would apply equally well to the redaction of two sources. We may also ask why the interpolator of the genealogy in 5 did not leave out its parallel in 4. Comparison with the Chronicler's method strengthens Volz' theory in the large, yet the Chronicler omitted what was incongruous with his own point of view. It seems natural to suppose that either the interpolator did omit the parallel material, and a later editor re-inserted it, or the editor who inserted 1, 5, 17, etc. had these passages in written form, as in the flood story. Possibly, however, the P sections formed not a consecutive narrative but a collection of edifying readings composed for liturgical use.

Whether the ultimate judgment of scholars is favorable or adverse to the views advocated in this book, it is well to have our theories questioned and re-examined whenever they become, as they have practically done in much of our teaching, a kind of dogma.

Brown University

Millar Burrows

DIE ALTORIENTALISCHE WEISHEIT
IN IHRER ISRAELITISCH-JÜDI-
SCHEN AUSPRÄGUNG. *Fichtner, J.*
1933 (Z. A. W. Beiheft 62).

In this work the development of the Hebrew Wisdom literature is traced in connection with similar literature in neighboring lands. It is shown to have been the result of assimilating into the religion of Yahweh materials from the Gentile environment and transforming them in the process. The older Hebrew Wisdom literature, both in general character and in specific content, has much in common with the Babylonian and Egyptian writings, but there are already some differences, notably a monotheistic theology and a strong ethical emphasis. The latter was not lacking in Egypt and Babylonia, but in Babylonia the ritual in-

terest was much stronger and in Egypt the merely prudential. While the motivation in the earlier Hebrew books was largely utilitarian, the norm of practical wisdom was often the will of Yahweh. Otherwise there was no national coloring whatever.

Later the differences between Jewish and Gentile wisdom literature became more pronounced. The problem of retribution and theodicy vitalized the Wisdom writings of Israel. As time went on, moreover, the conception of Wisdom became more and more nationalized. Since Yahweh was the God of Israel and had given Wisdom to Israel only, the Law became the norm of wise conduct, and this in turn brought ritual into the circle of Wisdom. The purely spiritual aspect of individual piety became stronger also, and the field of retribution was extended beyond the present life. The historical situation which explains this nationalizing process is the conflict between Judaism and Hellenism.

The value of this book lies not so much in the presentation of new materials as in the collocation and systematic comparison of much that was scattered and not always easily accessible. By setting the Wisdom books of the Old Testament over against those of Egypt and Babylonia, and by carrying the story down into the apocryphal and rabbinical writings, it achieves a sense of perspective and enables us to see this interesting portion of Hebrew literature in its relation to the culture of the ancient Orient and the religious life of Israel as a whole.

Brown University

Millar Burrows

MYTH AND RITUAL. Edited by S. H. H. Hooke. New York: Oxford University Press, 1932. Pp. XXI + 196. \$3.00.

Of quite unusual interest and importance to students and teachers of the Old Testament is this clear discussion of Hebrew myth and ritual in their relation to the "cultural pattern" of the ancient East. The editor has called in as collaborators a group of extremely competent specialists, each of whom treats of the particular phase of the subject in which his interest centers. Thus A. M.: Blackman deals with Egypt's myth and ritual, C. J. Gadd with Babylonia, the editor with Canaan, F. J. Hollis with "The Sun-cult and the Temple at Jerusalem," W. O. E. Oesterley with "Early Hebrew Festival Rituals," E. O. James with "Initiatory Rituals," and T. H. Robinson with "Hebrew

Myths." Anthropology, archaeology, comparative religion, biblical criticism and other related sciences are all brought within the ken of this investigation. Not all the opinions of these scholars, naturally, will command the assent of every lover of the Bible. But the evidence is conclusive that many more connections than are usually realized existed between Hebrew religion and the beliefs of Israel's neighbors. In the field of ritual these relationships seem to have included such elements as the death and resurrection of the God, the ritual combat, the sacred marriage and the ceremonial New Year's procession. Myths like the creation story and the Tammuz tale were recited or sung in connection with each of these sacred ceremonies. To certain of these features of ritual and popular belief the prophets were, of course, bitterly opposed. Other elements were so sublimated, or interpreted as to avoid giving any offense. The bearings of all this material upon contemporary religious beliefs is brought out both by Canon Simpson in the Foreword and by Professor Robinson in his very brief but finely constructive summary at the end of the final chapter.

Yale University

George Dahl

ARCHAEOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. By *Edouard Naville*. N. Y. Samuel R. Leland, 1932, pp. 224. \$1.75.

The late Edouard Naville was one of the foremost Egyptologists of his time. Among the many authoritative works in Egyptology his eight volumes on the *Two Temples at Dê-el-Bahri* place the archaeologist and the historian under lasting obligation to him. The appearance of the book before us bearing the imprint of 1932 is both a puzzle and a misfortune. It first appeared in 1913 issued by R. Scott of London in the Historical Theological Library and by Fleming and Revell in New York in the same year. The reviewer does not happen to have at hand either of these publications, but as the present edition bears neither introduction nor preface, and as the author passed away some years ago, it seems fair to assume that it is simply a reproduction of the 1913 edition.

Naville was not a biblical scholar, nor was he an Assyriologist. In the present work he built on a thesis of Prof. Sayce that Moses wrote in Babylonian cuneiform—a thesis which

Sayce himself abandoned years before he died. Naville defends the thesis that Moses wrote the Pentateuch on clay tablets. Overlooking the fact that there are long epics in cuneiform which occupy many tablets, he assumed that each tablet was complete in itself and that the lack of continuity of thought in the Pentateuch was due to the fact that Moses would jot down a poem on one tablet, a bit of law on another, and write a tradition on a third without attempting to connect them. However plausible the thesis may have seemed twenty-five years ago to one ignorant of the real criteria on which the analysis of the Pentateuch depends, it is now hopelessly out of date. The discoveries of alphabetical inscriptions at Jabel and of extended mythical poems in alphabetical writing at Ras Shamrah makes Naville's claim that alphabetical writing was not used for literary purposes till after the time of Solomon absurd. It is difficult to see any good purpose that this latest issue of such a misleading book at the present time can fulfill.

George A. Barton

University of Pennsylvania

THE CITADEL OF BETH-ZUR. By *Ovid Rogers Sellers*. Pp. 92, 4 Plans, 18 Plates, 72 Illustrations. The Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1933. \$1.00.

Beth-Zur is located four and one-half miles north of Hebron on the main road to Jerusalem. The site is represented by the mound Khurbat et Tubeiq, and not by Beit-Sur was formerly supposed. Zur was probably a primitive divinity, so Beth-Zur would mean the sanctuary of Zur. The word *zur*, meaning rock, was later applied to the God of Israel: Psalms 62:7, 89:26, 94:21. Beth-Zur was apparently a city of some prominence in the Old Testament. It is mentioned in Joshua 15:58, I Chron. 2:45, II Chron. 11:7, Neh. 3:16. In the Maccabean age it played a conspicuous role: I Macc. 4:28-61, 6:7, 26, 31, 48-50, 9:52, 10:14, 11:65, 66.

The Presbyterian Theological Seminary of Chicago furnished the means, and Prof. Sellers directed the excavation from June 3rd to July 29th, 1931. About 8,000 square meters of the city, chiefly on the acropolis, were uncovered. The strata were badly mixed because older stones and other materials of the earlier buildings were used every time the city was rebuilt. Early, Middle and Late Bronze, Early Iron

and Hellenistic pottery were found. Hellenistic coins, lamps, domestic implements and ornaments, stamped jar handles, inscribed weights, an inscribed seal, a scarab of Rameses II, and a carved Canaanite spoon were unearthed. All the finds amply substantiated the historical statements in I Maccabees thus confirming the authenticity of this book which well deserves a place among the Old Testament books.

The whole work was conducted in a thoroughly scientific manner. Dr. Sellers was assisted by some of the leading Palestinian archaeologists. The plans, plates and illustrations reflect the high water mark of workmanship. It is earnestly hoped that Prof. Sellers can continue excavating, to the bed rock, this important site.

George S. Duncan

The American University

THE OLD TESTAMENT SPEAKS. By Carl Sumner Knopf. Thomas Nelson and Sons. N. Y. 1933. Pp. XVIII—372.

Professor Knopf has written a really useful book for teachers and students of the Old Testament. Teachers will appreciate the book because it is a thorough, scholarly piece of work, although necessarily condensed. In Volume I, Part I of this journal, one member of our association, Professor Mary I. Hussey, reminded us in her article on "Recent Excavations in Mesopotamia as Related to the Teaching of the Bible" that the history of Old Testament times must be related to contemporary events in the neighboring countries of Western Asia. Professor Knopf, also a member of the association, has done this and done it very well. In his story of the origin of the Hebrews, the various peoples of Western Asia find their place in the record: the Hurrians, Hittites, the people of Amurru and Mitanni, Subareans, "emergent Semites, then Palestinian Semites." This broad perspective upon Hebrew history is sustained throughout the book. The most recent archaeological discoveries are incorporated in the findings of the author. Not only does Professor Knopf give an extensive bibliography at the end of his book, but the text itself is well documented with footnotes including frequent references to the authorities upon any particular subject. Numerous photographs of archaeological inscriptions add to the value of the book for the teacher.

"The Old Testament Speaks" is *usable* with classes of college students. The reviewer is at the present time using it as a reference book in an Old Testament course. The students like it. The language is vigorous. Even the table of contents is interesting, each section heading being written in the form of a striking question. The Philistines are "Aegean refugees." "Moses" in Egyptian means "child" or "Son" which suggests that the Egyptian princess called her little foundling "Sonny." Moses (Sonny) marries Zipporah (Birdy)!

Each chapter is prefaced with "Instructions" which may be adapted either to elementary or advanced work. These are suggestions which will really work. Each chapter is followed by a series of questions entitled "Thinking It Over," and topics "For Further Study." There are twelve maps.

Adelphi College

Carl E. Purinton

WHAT CAN WE BELIEVE—A Study of the New Protestantism. By James Gordon Gilkey. Pp. XI 164. The Macmillan Co., New York, 1933. \$1.50.

This is a most timely volume. The new biblical and scientific learning require some modification and restatement of many theological and religious beliefs. Large numbers of persons, young and old alike, find it difficult to make the needful adjustment. Dr. Gilkey's book is admirably fitted for this purpose. The work is scholarly but non-technical and popular. The ten chapters treat these very vital religious questions: "The New Foundation of Religion," "A Modern Conception of God," "Why is There so Much Suffering?" "The New Conception of Immortality," "What Should We Pray For?" "Can We Still Believe in God's Care?" "What Makes Right Right," "Why Humans Do Wrong," "What Jesus Means to a Modern Liberal," "Will the New Protestantism Endure?"

It is interesting to note the author's definition of God and Christianity, pp. 22 and 164. "By God then, we mean the Mind, the Power, and the Goodness working in and through the life-process." "True Christianity is the little group of creative ideas taught by Jesus Himself, together with the new spirit of kindness and confidence which flowed from these ideas."

George S. Duncan

The American University

DOES SCIENCE LEAVE ROOM FOR GOD? By R. O. P. Taylor. The Cokesbury Press, 246 pp.

This lucidly written and attractively printed volume is one of a series which attempts to deal with the problems which have been raised in the minds of plain people by the discoveries of modern science and the readjustments in thinking that have been necessary. The author not only answers his question affirmatively, but argues that science makes more room for God today than was formerly the case. He holds that belief in a purposive God who is responsible to man and works in cooperation with him to noble ends is the most reasonable interpretation of the universe which modern science opens up to us. The student who is trained in science, we are told, is much better prepared to believe in God and the records of historical religion than the one who has studied the classics, for the former has more patience in testing out the truth of the books before him and has learned to have a reverence for the books with which he deals, while the latter is trained in mythology and is skeptical of the materials of religion.

The leading argument of the book is based upon the harmony and uniformity of the universe revealed by science; intelligible, controlled by law in every part, perfectly coordinated in all of its manifold features, complete in the perfection of its design. It is inconceivable that this plan, this rationality, is accidental. It points to a mind which designed it. Moreover, the human mind which comprehends it must be essentially like the mind which planned it; that is, man must be made in the image of God. On the basis of recent physical theories about the constitution and nature of matter, it is urged that the rationality of the universe is greatly clarified.

Science leaves room for a creator, for it does not attempt to explain origins, and its concept of evolution is in harmony with a still active creator. The rôle of the individual in mutation or emergence even gives a basis for belief in God's choice of Abraham and his work with certain persons. The development of the O. T. conception of God fits into God's creation through evolution.

By a most suggestive use of various discoveries and hypotheses of science, room is found for belief in a law giver, a divine judge, in divine justice, in the incarnation, in the Holy

Spirit, and even in the Trinity. The book is suggestive and stimulating throughout.

At the same time, I find it unsatisfying in several ways. I follow the description of the scientific theory of the emergence of new forms, such as life and mind, or the appearance of a genius like Shakespeare, but that does not validate all the things which have been put forth by various religions as revelation. It does not even prove that the teachings of Hebrews and Christians were revelations. Moreover, if there is real harmony in the universe, there can be only one kind of truth. Either it is all natural or it is all supernatural. When this is borne in mind, it appears to me that revelation loses its significance.

Furthermore, the method of this author is very incomplete from the point of view of the modern study of religion. He shows no consideration of religions other than those of the Bible. So far as his argument goes, he validates monotheism, revelation, miracle, incarnation, etc., wherever found. The same argument which he uses to validate them in Christianity will do the same for every religion in existence. That is a perfectly legitimate conclusion to reach, but I dare say, our author does not mean to prove so much. He shows no awareness of the fact that most of these beliefs may be found in Hinduism, Buddhism, or one of the other great religions.

Again, his book is not quite true to its title. What the author has discussed is not, Does Science Leave Room for God? but does it leave room for Christian theology. That is a very different matter. The nature of the author's task makes his book an apologetic. The book would have been more helpful to me if the author had taken his stand squarely upon the results of science, asking not what science leaves us about God, but what it positively demonstrates about Him. Even on this more solid basis, I dare say, he would have found an abundance of material.

Goucher College S. Vernon MacCasland

CHILDREN AND PURITANISM. By Sandford Fleming. Yale University Press, 1933. \$2.50.

"Brethren, a new day has come." These were the words of Horace Bushnell, closing his "Arguments for Discourses on Christian Nurture" in 1847. The author of the book, Professor Sandford Fleming of Berkeley Bap-

tist Divinity School, agrees with the statement and in fifteen of its sixteen chapters describes ably and convincingly the distressing situation in which children found themselves during the two centuries of New England religious history before Horace Bushnell ushered in the new day. The older readers of this JOURNAL (of whom the reviewer is one) can remember the religious conservatism, the sabbatarianism, and the catechetical instruction of their childhood. The book makes it clear, however, that those days were enlightened indeed as compared with the ones which are here pictured. The book, which is one of the "Yale Studies in Religious Education" is a scholarly and interesting study of our early religious history and especially of the attitude of our fathers toward their children in the area of their religious needs and corresponding religious appeal. Horace Bushnell is rightly portrayed as the one who rebelled against the older point of view as to children and as the one who pointed out the path along which we have since his day been traveling. There is a full bibliography, a good set of notes and an index. Western College *Ralph K. Hickok*

SNOWDEN'S SUNDAY SCHOOL LESSONS 1934. By *James H. Snowden*. The Macmillan Company. 1933. Pp. 373. \$1.35.

This is a thoughtful, homiletic exposition of the Sunday School lessons, with practical applications to modern social, moral, economic, and religious problems. It is exceedingly well articulated. Good as it is, it might be vastly improved by a thoroughgoing use of modern methods and results of biblical scholarship. Here is a field into which members of NABI should enter and exploit. The host of devout, well-meaning, and inquiring Sunday School scholars, old and young, deserve more of our attention than has been given them. It might do much in gradually spreading a juster conception of the Bible.

Syracuse University

Ismar J. Peritz

COMMON OBJECTIONS TO CHRISTIANITY. By *C. L. Drawbridge*. With a Survey of the Leaders and Literature in the Conflict Between Christianity and Its Opponents. By *Edwin Lewis*. Samuel R. Leland, Inc. N. Y. 1933. Revised Edition. Pp. XXIX—278. \$2.50.

The author, who is the Hon. Secretary of the Christian Evidence Society in England, has found that there are well-organized anti-theistic societies in the United Kingdom and in America, consisting of keen thinkers and many of them well versed in the arguments on behalf of atheism, agnosticism, determinism, and materialism. He combatted with them in the public parks of London, and found the same arguments among the students of Oxford and Cambridge Universities. His book is the outcome of his experiences in defending Christian theism. It is a simple and popular treatment of the common objections to Christianity, well designed to make clear that there is still solid ground for theistic faith, and to inspire to further study of apologetics.

Prof. Edwin Lewis, who is Professor of Systematic Theology and Philosophy of Religion in Drew University, contributes a succinct survey of apologetics, ancient and modern, finely supplementing the purpose of the book. Syracuse University *Ismar J. Peritz*

DAILY BIBLE STUDIES. By *Floyd W. Tomkins*. Milwaukee: Morehouse Publishing Co., 1933. Pp. 235. \$1.50.

Originally prepared for The Living Church, these devotional studies by the late Dr. Tomkins of Philadelphia have now been arranged by his son according to the Episcopal church year. Each study consists of a very brief Scripture reference, a comment by the author, and the number of an appropriate hymn. Each week of studies ends with a short prayer. The point of view is that of a cultured, deeply spiritual and quite conservative rector. His conservatism shows itself particularly in the repeated references to the literal Second Coming of Christ, and a correspondingly excessive use of the book of Revelation. To those, especially of the older generation, who share his general point of view the fine spirit of Dr. Tomkin's book will undoubtedly bring help and inspiration. On the other hand, its failure to take any account of the results of modern biblical research, as also its neglect of the contributions of recent studies in the fields of philosophy and psychology of religion, would seem to make the book less useful for younger people. Rather discouraging is the surprisingly meager use made of the extraordinary wealth of devotional material to be found in the Old Testament. In fact, this book shares

the common fault of much devotional literature in skimping the biblical material. That our spiritually illiterate generation sadly needs a revival of the devotional life can hardly be gainsaid. To this end we need helps that combine a modern point of view and approach with intense religious enthusiasm. Here is a task for some member—or members—of the NABI to undertake!

Yale University

George Dahl

THE BRITISH ISRAEL THEORY. By *H. L. Goudge*. Morehouse Publishing Co. Milwaukee, Wis. 1933. Pp. 100. 70c.

What became of the Northern Tribes after Sargon destroyed Samaria in 722 B. C. and carried them captive into Assyria? They were akin to their captors in race, language, and, in spite of the protests of the prophets, in religion; what was there to keep them intact? Consequently, it is supposed that they amalgamated and were lost by absorption. But not so the *British Israel Theory*. On the basis of an apocryphal story, they were supposed to have become the Scythians, with a home in what is now South Russia. From thence they were supposed to have migrated into Britain, involving the ability of changing racial characteristics, unlike the Ethiopians, becoming first Iranians or Mongolians, then big blonde Norsemen, and finally Britons.

To controvert this absurdity which has taken so strong a hold on a considerable number of English, a Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford feels compelled to write this booklet. He deals with the subject in a scholarly and at the same time humorous fashion, disposing of each so-called argument, and showing its baselessness. It ought to settle the question; but will it?

Syracuse University

Ismar J. Peritz

BY THE WATERS OF BABYLON. A Story of Ancient Israel. By *Louis Wallis*. The Macmillan Co. 1931. Pp. 222. \$2.00.

A wholesome love story, written in imitation of biblical English, laid in the stirring times of Jeremiah and the Fall of Jerusalem under Nebuchadnezzar. The author knows biblical history; and makes much of the production of Deuteronomy. He brings out in striking fashion the contrasts in social, moral, economic, and religious ideals between Baalism and the teachings of the prophets. It is a good

book for collateral reading in connection with courses in Old Testament history or the Bible as literature.

Syracuse University

Ismar J. Peritz

THE BIBLE AND THE QUEST OF LIFE.

By *Bruce Curry*. Oxford University Press, 1933. Pp. xi + 316. \$1.75.

This is not intended as a text-book on the history or literature of the Bible, nor is it a volume of essays on biblical subjects, but a book for "Bible classes and study groups or . . . a guide to personal Bible reading and meditation." As such it is a welcome book, for Dr. Curry has done supremely well what has often been poorly done. He has, in fifty-two clear, thoughtful studies, set forth the most significant teachings of the Bible which have vital bearings upon life-problems of the present, and he has done this without any forcing of interpretations or divorcing of materials from their real settings for the sake of pointing a moral.

The method may best be illustrated by the procedure followed in each study: a brief statement of the general problem; carefully-selected Bible passages with crisp, pithy comments; a summary of the main points of emphasis in the passages; a group of suggestive questions focusing the whole upon present life-values. Dr. Curry's book richly merits wide usage by Bible study groups, not only in the present critical days for its timely insights into human experiences and problems, but for a good many years for its stimulating and effective presentation of the timeless messages of the Bible.

Haverford College

J. W. Flight

FAITH: AN HISTORICAL STUDY. By *Stewart Means*. With an Introduction by R. Goodenough. Macmillan, 1933. Pp. xiii + 334. \$2.50.

Dr. Means in his preface quotes Coleridge ("There are cases in which more knowledge of more value may be conveyed by the history of a word than by the history of a campaign") as the inspiration to his writing of this masterly volume. One feels as he reads the book that the author has kept faith with his inspiration through the thirty years (of his eighty-odd years of life) which he devoted to this task. The book begins with the biblical origins and development of faith as a divine-human rela-

tionship and carries the discussion through well-defined periods of Christian history to the Counter-Reformation. It is difficult to say which of the eight chapters is finest, for each presents a satisfyingly balanced study of the "forces at work shaping the different forms in which the interpretation of the word Faith found expression" in the period under consideration. This reviewer's choice is: I. The Jewish Conception of Faith; II. The New Testament; VII. Martin Luther and the Revolution of the Sixteenth Century. There is throughout evidence of scholarly research, mature judgment and appreciative insight into the spirit of the men and movements which come under discussion. Dr. Means has given us a book that "informs rather than merely amuses or inspires," and its charm and clarity of style renders the very solidity of its material stimulating and interesting.

Haverford College

J. W. Flight

SERMONS FROM THE PARABLES. By Clovis G. Chappell. Cokesbury Press, 1933. Pp. 220. \$1.50.

Here is the dozenth volume of sermons from the pen of Dr. Chappell who has, through his volumes on the Psalms, the Sermon on the Mount, Bible Characters, etc., become familiar to those who fancy practical and timely expository dealing with great blocks of biblical material. Perhaps the teacher of Bible in college

and secondary school has, normally, little interest in or time for sermon volumes; but occasionally such a book as this one by Dr. Chappell, may serve the valuable purpose of supplementing the more solid scholarly works by giving a suggestive and vigorous treatment of material which too easily becomes stilted in the classroom. Dr. Chappell speaks to every-day human experience rather than to the intellect, but he constantly strikes home to vital life-situations and needs.

Haverford College

J. W. Flight

BOOKS RECEIVED

THE GOSPEL OF THE HELLENISTS.

By Benjamin Wisner Bacon. Henry Holt and Company. N. Y. 1933. Pp. XIII-432. \$4.00.

THE HEBREW LITERARY GENIUS. By

Duncan Black Macdonald. Princeton University Press. Princeton, N. J. 1933. Pp. XXIV-227. \$2.50.

GREEK PAPYRI OF THE FIRST CEN-

TURY. By W. Hersey Davis. Harper & Brothers. 1933. Pp. XXX-84. \$2.00.

THE ARCHAEOLOGY OF PALESTINE

AND THE BIBLE. By William Foxwell Albright. Revell. Revised Ed. 1933. Pp. 246. \$2.00.

A HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN

CHURCH. By Lars P. Qualben. Nelson. 1933. XXII-590 pages.

nal

in-
oc-
Dr.
e of
orks
ment
d in
ery-
in-
vital

ht

STS.
Holt
432.

. By
Uni-
Pp.

CEN-
ber &

INE
xwell
Pp.

IAN
elson.